arXiv:1401.7726v3 [math.GT] 5 Dec 2014

FOLIATIONS, ORDERS, REPRESENTATIONS, L-SPACES AND GRAPH MANIFOLDS

STEVEN BOYER AND ADAM CLAY

Abstract. We show that the properties of admitting a co-oriented taut foliation and having a left-orderable fundamental group are equivalent for rational homology 3-sphere graph manifolds and relate them to the property of not being a Heegaard-Floer L-space. This is accomplished in several steps. First we show how to detect families of slopes on the boundary of a Seifert fibred manifold in four different fashions—using representations, using left-orders, using foliations, and using Heegaard-Floer homology. Then we show that each method of detection determines the same family of detected slopes. Next we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a co-oriented taut foliation on a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere, respectively a left-order on its fundamental group, which depend solely on families of detected slopes on the boundaries of its pieces. The fact that Heegaard-Floer methods can be used to detect families of slopes on the boundary of a Seifert fibred manifold combines with certain conjectures in the literature to suggest an L-space gluing theorem for rational homology 3-sphere graph manifolds as well as other interesting problems in Heegaard-Floer theory.

December 8, 2014

1. Introduction

Much work has been devoted in recent years to examining relationships between the existence of a co-oriented taut foliation in a closed, connected, prime 3-manifold W, the left-orderability of its fundamental group, and the property that it *not* be a Heegaard-Floer L-space. Indeed, it has been conjectured that the three conditions coincide. (See Conjecture 1 of [BGW] and Conjecture 5 of [Ju].) When W has a positive first Betti number, each condition holds ([Ga1, Theorem 5.5, page 477] and [BRW, Theorem 1.1]). Further, it follows from [BRW, Theorems 1.3 and 1.7] that when W is a non-hyperbolic geometric manifold, W has a left-orderable fundamental group if and only if it admits a co-oriented taut foliation. On the other hand, [BGW, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1] imply that for such manifolds, the latter is equivalent to the condition that W not be an L-space. Thus understanding the relationship between the three conditions reduces to the case when W is a rational homology 3-sphere which is either hyperbolic or has a non-trivial JSJ decomposition. In this paper we show that the first two conditions are equivalent when W is a graph manifold (cf. Theorem 1.2) and make some steps toward relating them to the third in this case. With regards to the latter, there is enough control in the constructions of this paper for us to obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.1. ([BC, Theorem 1.1]) *If a graph manifold rational homology* 3*-sphere has a left-orderable fundamental group, then it is not an L-space.*

Further, the methods we develop here allow us to formulate an L-space gluing conjecture whose truth implies the inverse implication of Theorem 1.1. See Conjecture 1.10 and Problem 1.11 below.

The equivalence between the existence of a co-oriented taut foliation on a graph manifold and the left-orderability of its fundamental group takes on various forms, depending on the types of foliations considered (cf. Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.5). And, since the fundamental group of a connected, prime, orientable 3-manifold W is left-orderable if and only if it admits a homomorphism to $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ with non-trivial image ([Li], [BRW, Theorem 1.1(1)]), we translate the order-theoretic statements Theorems

Steven Boyer was partially supported by NSERC grant RGPIN 9446-2008.
Adam Clay was partially supported by an NSERC postdoctoral fellowship.
2000 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION. PRIMARY 57M25, 57M50, 57M99

1.2(2), 1.3(2) and 1.5(2) into their representation-theoretic counterparts (Theorems 1.2(3), 1.3(3) and 1.5(3)), which are of independent interest.

Theorem 1.2. *Let W be a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *W admits a co-oriented taut foliation.*

(2) *$\pi_1(W)$ is left-orderable.*

(3) *There is a homomorphism $\rho : \pi_1(W) \to Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$ with non-trivial image.*

Theorem 1.2 is known to hold when W is Seifert fibred [BRW], [BGW] (and that (1), (2), and (3) are equivalent to W not being an L-space [LS]). In this case the foliations can be chosen to be horizontal. In other words, they are transverse to the Seifert fibres of W. More generally, a co-dimension 1 foliation in a graph manifold W is called *horizontal* if it is transverse to the Seifert fibres in each piece of W. We can refine Theorem 1.2 by restricting our attention to this important family of foliations. Let $\mathrm{sh}(1) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the homeomorphism $\mathrm{sh}(1)(x) = x + 1$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let W be a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *W admits a co-oriented horizontal foliation.*

(2) *$\pi_1(W)$ admits a left-order in which the class of any Seifert fibre in any piece of W is cofinal.*

(3) *There is a homomorphism $\rho : \pi_1(W) \to Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$ such that the image of the class of any Seifert fibre in any piece of W is conjugate in $Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$ to $sh(\pm 1)$.*

Here is a consequence of the proofs of these results. Call a co-oriented taut foliation *rational* if up to isotopy it intersects each JSJ torus of W in a fibration with a compact leaf.

Proposition 1.4. *If W admits a co-oriented taut foliation, respectively a horizontal co-oriented foliation, it admits a co-oriented taut rational foliation, respectively a horizontal co-oriented rational foliation.*

A fundamental open problem in 3-manifold topology is to determine whether 3-manifolds which admit co-oriented taut foliations admit smooth co-oriented taut foliations. The problem is open even in the case of graph manifolds. Though the constructions which lead to the proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 do not yield smooth foliations in general, we can strengthen Proposition 1.4 and guarantee smoothness under suitable hypotheses.

Call a co-oriented taut foliation *strongly rational* if up to isotopy it intersects each JSJ torus of W in a fibration by simple closed curves. Since no co-oriented taut foliation on a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere W can intersect a JSJ-torus T in a fibration by simple closed curves representing the fibre slope in a piece of W incident to T, at least up to assuming that the Seifert structures on pieces homeomorphic to twisted I-bundles over the Klein bottle have orientable base orbifolds (Lemma 6.4), a strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation is necessarily horizontal. Boileau and Boyer have shown that a graph manifold integer homology 3-sphere admits a strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation if and only if it is neither S^3 nor the Poincaré homology 3-sphere $\Sigma(2,3,5)$ [BB]. We will see below that if W admits a strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation, it admits a smooth strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation, so it is of interest to prove a version of the theorems above for this category of foliations.

Theorem 1.5. *Let W be a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *W admits a strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation.*

(2) *$\pi_1(W)$ admits a left-order $\mathfrak{o}$ in which the class of any Seifert fibre in any piece of W is cofinal and there is an $\mathfrak{o}$-convex normal subgroup C of $\pi_1(W)$ such that $C \cap \pi_1(T) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for each JSJ-torus T in W.*

(3) *There is a homomorphism* $\rho : \pi_1(W) \to Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$ *such that the image of the class of any Seifert fibre in any piece of* W *is conjugate in* $Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$ *to* $sh(\pm 1)$ *and* $ker(\rho|\pi_1(T)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ *for each JSJ-torus* T *in* W.

The hypotheses of (i) admitting a co-oriented taut foliation, (ii) admitting a horizontal co-oriented taut foliation, and (iii) admitting a strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation are successively more constraining on a graph manifold W. (See §12.) In particular, not every graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere which admits a co-oriented taut foliation also admits a strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation. On the other hand, the results above combine with those of the Appendix to imply that this is true generically (in terms of the gluing of its pieces).

Our strategy for establishing these theorems is based on the two main technical results of the paper: Theorem 8.1, a slope detection theorem, and Theorem 9.5, a gluing theorem. More precisely, we introduce four different methods of detecting a family of slopes on the boundary of a Seifert fibred manifold M: using representations (§3), using left-orders (§4), using foliations (§6), and using Heegaard-Floer homology (§7)[1]. Theorem 8.1 states that any two of these notions coincide when both are defined. Next, Theorem 9.5 provides necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of co-oriented taut foliations on a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere, respectively a left-order on its fundamental group, from families of appropriately detected slopes on the boundaries of its pieces. The gluing conditions depend only on slope detectability, which leads to the equivalences of Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.5. Here are special cases of the slope detection and gluing theorems. See §2.2.3 for the definition of the manifolds N_t.

Theorem 1.6. *Let* M *be a Seifert manifold with base orbifold* $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ *or* $Q(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ *where* P *is a punctured 2-sphere and* Q *is a punctured projective plane. Let* $\emptyset \neq \partial M = T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_r$ *be the decomposition of* ∂M *into its toral boundary components. Let* $[\alpha_j]$ *be a slope on* T_j *and set* $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r])$. *The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $[\alpha_*]$ *is detected by some co-oriented taut foliation on* M.

(2) $[\alpha_*]$ *is detected by some left-order on* $\pi_1(M)$.

(3) *If no* $[\alpha_j]$ *is vertical in a Seifert piece incident to* T_j, $[\alpha_*]$ *is detected by some homomorphism* $\rho : \pi_1(M) \to \widetilde{Homeo}_+(S^1)$.

(4) *If* $[\alpha_*]$ *is rational, then there is an integer* $t \geq 2$ *such that if* W *is any manifold obtained by attaching* r *copies of* N_t *to* M *such that the rational longitude of* N_t *is identified with* $[\alpha_j]$ *for each* j, *then* W *is not an L-space.*

Theorem 1.7. *Let* W *be a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere with JSJ pieces* $M_1, \dots, M_n$. *For each piece* M_i *and* m*-tuple of slopes* $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_m])$, *one for each of the JSJ tori, let* $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ *be the sub-tuple of* $[\alpha_*]$ *corresponding to the boundary components of* M_i. *Then,*

(1) W *admits a co-oriented taut foliation if and only if there is an* m*-tuple of slopes* $[\alpha_*]$ *such that for each* i, $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ *is detected by some co-oriented taut foliation on* M_i.

(2) $\pi_1(W)$ *is left-orderable if and only if there is an* m*-tuple of slopes* $[\alpha_*]$ *such that for each* i, $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ *is detected by some left-order on* $\pi_1(M_i)$.

The fundamental group of an irreducible rational homology 3-sphere graph manifold which admits a co-oriented taut foliation acts by orientation-preserving homeomorphisms on S^1 via Thurston's universal circle construction [CD], and hence is circularly-orderable. One can promote the circular-ordering to a left-ordering whenever the action lifts to an action on $\mathbb{R}$, but the existence of such a lift depends upon the vanishing of an obstruction in the finite group $H^2(W)$. It would be interesting to see how the hypotheses of the gluing theorem can be used to show that this obstruction can be made to vanish.

[1]It is also be possible to detect slopes via contact structures, but we do not pursue this here.

As mentioned above, statements (1) and (2) of Theorem 1.2 are known to be equivalent (cf. [Li], [BRW, Theorem 1.1(1)]). The remaining equivalences claimed in Theorem 1.2 are immediate consequences of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7. Theorems 1.3 and 1.5 will follow in a similar fashion.

Various problems and questions arise naturally from this study, most importantly with regards to the Heegaard-Floer aspects of the detection theorem and the potential for a Heegaard-Floer version of the gluing theorem.

Question 1.8. For a given $t \geq 2$, is NLS detection determined exclusively in terms of N_t? In particular, is it determined in terms of the twisted I-bundle over the Klein bottle N_2 (cf. Remark 7.17)? (We expect this to be the case.) More generally, can an arbitrary Heegaard-Floer solid torus with incompressible boundary be used to determine NLS detection?

Although the definition of NLS detection is extrinsic to the ambient manifold, we expect that there to be an intrinsic definition.

Problem 1.9. Determine an intrinsic definition of NLS detection in terms, for instance, of the bordered Heegaard-Floer theory of the ambient manifold. Do this in such a way so as to remove the restriction that NLS detection be defined only for families of rational slopes.

Conjecture 1 of [BGW] contends that an irreducible rational homology 3-sphere W is not an L-space if and only if its fundamental group is left-orderable. Consideration of Theorem 1.1 reduces the conjecture to showing that if W has a non-left-orderable fundamental group then W is not an L-space. From the point of view of the detection and gluing theorems, this leads to the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.10. The gluing theorem holds in the context of NLS detection. That is, a rational homology 3-sphere graph manifold W is *not* an L-space if and only if there is an m-tuple of rational slopes $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_m])$, one for each JSJ torus of W, such that for each i, $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ is NLS detected (cf. Theorem 1.7).

The conjecture is unknown even when W has only two pieces. Here is the simplest open case.

Problem 1.11. Show that the union $W = M_1 \cup M_2$ of two trefoil exteriors along $T = \partial M_1 = \partial M_2$ is an L-space if and only if the set of slopes on T detected from M_1 is disjoint from the set of slopes on T detected from M_2.

Our notions of order detection, representation detection, foliation detection and NLS detection extend to general compact connected orientable 3-manifolds whose boundaries consist of tori.

Question 1.12. To what extent do the detection and gluing theorems hold in this more general setting? (Compare with [CLW, Conjecture 4.3].)

This question is of particular importance considering the approach to Conjecture 1 of [BGW] and Conjecture 5 of [Ju] developed in this paper.

Finally, we ask:

Question 1.13. If a graph manifold admits a co-oriented taut foliation, does it admit a smooth co-oriented taut foliation?

See §12.2 as well as [BC] for remarks and an initial analysis of this question.

Here is how the paper is organised. Background material is introduced in §2 while the notions of representation detection, order detection and foliation detection are developed in §3, §4 and §6 respectively. The goal of §5 is to show how to relate represention detection to both order detection and foliation detection in a slope preserving fashion. The equivalence of statements (2) and (3) of Theorems 1.3 and 1.5 are dealt with there. See Remark 5.5. We introduce NLS-detection (i.e. not an L-space detection)

in §7 and develop the background to show that it is equivalent to foliation detection when restricted to families of rational slopes. One of the main technical results of this paper is the slope detection theorem, Theorem 8.1, which is stated and proved in §8. The second main technical result is the gluing theorem, Theorem 9.5, which is stated in §9 and then proved over the next two sections. Proposition 1.4 is proved in §10. We make a few comments on smoothness issues and provide examples which illustrate Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.5 and their differences in §12. Finally we collect the results of Eisenbud, Hirsch and Neumann, of Jankins and Neumann, and of Naimi on representations of fundamental groups of Seifert manifolds with values in $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ in Appendix A and translate them into the form needed for the purposes of this paper.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Michel Boileau and Liam Watson for helpful conversations concerning the material of this paper. They would also like to thank Danny Calegari for insightful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript and Jonathan Bowden who pointed out a gap in our original proof of Theorem 1.1 and who provided the technique needed to fill it.

2. Assumptions and notation

We introduce assumptions and notation here which will be used throughout the paper.

2.1. **Slopes.** A *slope* on a torus T is the class $[\alpha]$ of a non-zero element $\alpha \in H_1(T;\mathbb{R})$ in the projective space

$$\mathcal{S}(T) = \mathbb{P}^1(H_1(T;\mathbb{R})) \cong S^1$$

We call a slope on T *rational* if it is represented by a class $\alpha \in H_1(T)$. Otherwise we call it *irrational*.

A *rational longitude* of a compact, connected, orientable 3-manifold N with boundary a torus is a primitive class $\lambda_N \in H_1(\partial N)$ which represents a torsion element when considered as an element of $H_1(N)$. Rational longitudes exist and are well-defined up to sign. Thus they determine a well-defined slope $[\lambda_N] \in \mathcal{S}(\partial N)$.

2.2. **Seifert manifolds.** Throughout this paper P will denote a punctured 2-sphere, Q a punctured projective plane and Q_0 a Möbius band. We use M to denote a compact, connected, orientable Seifert fibred 3-manifold, distinct from $S^1 \times D^2$ and $S^1 \times S^1 \times I$, whose boundary is a non-empty union of tori $T_1, \dots, T_r$. We also assume that M embeds in a rational homology 3-sphere. Equivalently, M has base orbifold of the form $P(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ or $Q(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ where $n \geq 0$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \geq 2$. The Seifert fibring on M is unique up to isotopy unless M is a twisted I-bundle over the Klein bottle, denoted N_2, which admits exactly two isotopy classes of Seifert structures. One has base orbifold Q_0 and the other has base orbifold $D^2(2,2)$. Let $h_0, h_1 \in H_1(\partial N_2)$ denote, respectively, primitive classes carried by a Seifert fibre of the structure with base orbifold Q_0, respectively $D^2(2,2)$. Then $\{h_0, h_1\}$ is a basis of $H_1(\partial N_2)$ well-defined up to sign change of h_0 or h_1. The rational longitude of N_2 is represented by h_0.

When $M \ncong N_2$ the class of a regular Seifert fibre of M is well-defined up to taking inverses and we use $h \in \pi_1(M)$ to denote it. For each boundary component T_j of M we will also use h to denote a primitive class of $H_1(T_j)$ represented by a Seifert fibre. When $M \cong N_2$, h will correspond to either h_0 or h_1, depending on the Seifert structure chosen for M.

Define

$$\mathcal{S}(M) = \{([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r]) : [\alpha_j] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j) \text{ for each } j\} \cong (S^1)^r$$

We call $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ *rational* if each $[\alpha_j]$ is rational, and *horizontal* if no $[\alpha_j]$ coincides with the slope of the fibre class $[h]$. We use $v([\alpha_*])$ will denote the number of vertical $[\alpha_j]$:

$$v([\alpha_*]) = |\{j : [\alpha_j] = [h]\}|$$

Thus $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal if and only if $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$.

Without loss of generality we suppose that the Seifert invariants $(a_1, b_1), \ldots, (a_n, b_n)$ of the exceptional fibres of M satisfy $0 < b_i < a_i$ for each i. Set

$$\gamma_i = \frac{b_i}{a_i} \in (0, 1)$$

The fundamental group of M admits a presentation of the following form.

2.2.1. *Seifert manifolds over $Q(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$.*

$$\pi_1(M) = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_n, x_1, \ldots, x_r, z, h_0 : [x_j, h_0] = 1, [y_i, h_0] = 1, y_i^{a_i} = h_0^{b_i}, z h_0 z^{-1} = h_0^{-1}, \\ y_1 y_2 \ldots y_n x_1 \ldots x_r z^2 = 1 \rangle$$

Here x_j carries a *dual class* h_j^* to h_0 on T_j, $1 \leq j \leq r$. This means that $\{h_0, h_j^*\}$ is a basis of $H_1(T_j) = \pi_1(T_j)$.

2.2.2. *Seifert manifolds over $P(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$.*

$$\pi_1(M) = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_n, x_1, \ldots, x_r, h : h \text{ central}, y_i^{a_i} = h^{b_i}, y_1 y_2 \ldots y_n x_1 \ldots x_r = 1 \rangle$$

Again, x_j carries a *dual class* to h on T_j, $1 \leq j \leq r$.

2.2.3. *A special family of Seifert fibred manifolds.* For each integer $t \geq 2$ let N_t be the Seifert fibred space with base orbifold a 2-disk and $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{t}, \gamma_2 = \frac{t-1}{t}$. (Thus N_2 is the twisted I-bundle over the Klein bottle, as above.) There is a unique Seifert structure on N_t with an orientable base orbifold. We use $h_1 \in H_1(\partial N_t)$ to be a primitive class carried by a fibre of this structure (cf. §2.2.2). In analogy with the case $t = 2$ we will use h_0 to denote a primitive class in $H_1(\partial N_t)$ representing the rational longitude of N_t. The reader will verify using the presentation for $\pi_1(N_t)$ in §2.2.2 that $h_0 = h_1^* + h_1$ has order t in $H_1(N_t)$. Thus

$$\Delta(h_0, h_1) = 1$$

and there is an oriented horizontal surface F in N_t with t boundary components, each like-oriented on ∂N_t and of slope $[h_0]$. It follows that the restriction of the Seifert map $N_t \to D^2(t, t)$ to each boundary component of F is a homeomorphism onto its image $\partial D^2(t, t)$. Thus,

Lemma 2.1. *The monodromy of the fibring $N_t \to S^1$ with fibre F has order t.* □

Lemma 2.2. *The image of Homeo$(N_t) \to GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ which sends $F \in$ Homeo(N_t) to the matrix of $(F|\partial N_t)_* : H_1(\partial N_t) \to H_1(\partial N_t)$ is given by $\{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right), \left(\begin{smallmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{smallmatrix}\right), \left(\begin{smallmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right), \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\}$ when expressed in terms of the basis $\{h_0, h_1\}$.*

Proof. By their definition, h_0 and h_1 are preserved by any homeomeorphism of N_t, at least up to sign. It is easy to see that there is an $F_1 \in$ Homeo(N_t) which similtaneously inverts the orientations of the base and fibre of N_t. Thus $(F_1|\partial N_t)_* = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Similarly using the fact that the exceptional fibres of N_t have Seifert invariants $(t, 1)$ and $(t, t-1)$, we can construct an orientation-reversing homeomorphism F_2 of N_t which switches the two exceptional fibres. This implies the result since $\det((F_2|\partial N_t)_*) = -1$. □

2.3. **Graph manifolds.** Throughout this paper W will denote a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere. Thus W contains a disjoint family of incompressible tori $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_m\}$ which split it into a family $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_n$ of connected Seifert manifolds of the type described in §2.2. Define

$$\mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T}) = \{([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_m]) : [\alpha_j] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j) \text{ for all } j\} \cong (S^1)^m$$

An element $[\alpha_*]$ of $\mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ will be called *rational* if each of its components is a rational slope.

An element $[\alpha_*]$ of $\mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ will be called *horizontal* if for each T_j in $\mathcal{T}$ the associated component of $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal in the two pieces of W incident to T_j.

For each i we have a projection map

$$\Pi_i : \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T}) \to \mathcal{S}(M_i)$$

which associates to each $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ the $|\partial M_i|$-tuple of associated slopes corresponding the components of ∂M_i. We shall write

$$\Pi_i([\alpha_*]) = [\alpha_*^{(i)}]$$

3. Detecting horizontal slopes via representations

Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold M as in §2.2. In this section we review the results of Eisenbud-Hirsch-Neumann, of Jankins-Neumann, and of Naimi concerning the relationship between slopes on ∂M and representations of $\pi_1(M)$ with values in $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$.

3.1. **Representation detection of horizontal slopes.** For $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ we use $\mathrm{sh}(\gamma) \in \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ to denote the translation homeomorphism $\mathrm{sh}(\gamma)(x) = x+\gamma$. The universal cover $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ of $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(S^1)$ can be identified in a natural way with the centraliser of $\mathrm{sh}(1)$ in $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$:

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1) = \{f \in \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R}) : f(x+1) = f(x)+1\}$$

There is a continuous, conjugation-invariant *translation number* quasimorphism

$$\tau : \widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1) \to \mathbb{R}$$

for which $\tau(\mathrm{sh}(\gamma)) = \gamma$ and which is a homomorphism when restricted to an abelian subgroup of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ (cf. [Gh, §5]). It is known that $\tau(f) = 0$ if and only if f has a fixed point.

We leave the proof of the following elementary lemma to the reader.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $f \in Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$.*

(1) *If f has no fixed point, then it is conjugate in $Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$ to $sh(1)$ if $\tau(f) > 0$ and to $sh(-1)$ if $\tau(f) < 0$.*

(2) *If there is a $k \geq 1$ such that $f^k = sh(1)$, then there is a $g \in \widetilde{Homeo}_+(S^1)$ such that $g \circ f \circ g^{-1} = sh(\frac{1}{k})$.* □

Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2 and define

$$\mathcal{R}_0(M) = \{\rho \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1(M), \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})) : \rho(h) = \mathrm{sh}(1)\}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold M as in §2.2.*

(1) *If M has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ then $\mathcal{R}_0(M) = \emptyset$.*

(2) *Suppose that M has base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$.*

   (a) *$\mathcal{R}_0(M) \subset Hom(\pi_1(M), \widetilde{Homeo}_+(S^1))$.*

   (b) *Consider the presentation of $\pi_1(M)$ given in §2.2.2. Then for each $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ and $i \in \{1,2,\dots,n\}$, $\rho(y_i)$ is conjugate to $sh(\gamma_i)$.*

Proof. Suppose that M has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$. There is an element $z \in \pi_1(M)$ such that $zhz^{-1} = h^{-1}$ (cf. the presentation of $\pi_1(M)$ given in §2.2.1). Since $\rho(z) \in \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$, $\rho(z)(x) < \rho(z)(y)$ for each pair of real numbers $x < y$. But then for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho(z)(x) < \rho(z)(x+1) = \rho(z)(\rho(h)(x)) = \rho(h^{-1})(\rho(z)(x)) = \rho(z)(x) - 1 < \rho(z)(x)$, a contradiction. Thus assertion (1) of the lemma holds.

If M has base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ then h is central in $\pi_1(M)$ (§2.2.2) so the image of any $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ is contained in $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$. Therefore part (a) of assertion (2) holds. Part (b) follows immediately from Lemma 3.1(2). □

If $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$, then for each $1 \leq j \leq r$, kernel$((\tau \circ \rho|) \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}} : \pi_1(T_j) \otimes \mathbb{R} = H_1(T_j;\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{R}$ and hence determines a slope $[\alpha_j(\rho)] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j)$. Note that if $h_j^* \in H_1(T_j)$ is the dual class to h corresponding to x_j, then as $\rho(h) = \mathrm{sh}(1)$ we have

$$[\alpha_j(\rho)] = [\tau(\rho(h_j^*))h - h_j^*]$$

Thus $[\alpha_j(\rho)]$ is horizontal. We call $[\alpha_*(\rho)] = ([\alpha_1(\rho)], [\alpha_2(\rho)], \ldots, [\alpha_r(\rho)])$ the *slope* of ρ.

Definition 3.3. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$. A slope $[\alpha_j] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j)$ is *detected* by ρ, or ρ-*detected*, if $[\alpha_j] = [\alpha_j(\rho)]$. It is *strongly* ρ-*detected* if it is ρ-detected and $\rho|\pi_1(T_j)$ conjugates into the translation subgroup of $\mathbb{R}$. For $J \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ and $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$, we say that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is ρ-*detected* if $\rho|\pi_1(T_j)$ detects $[\alpha_j]$ for all j and strongly detects $[\alpha_j]$ for $j \in J$. Finally, we say that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is *representation-detected* if it is ρ-detected for some $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$.

We shall often simplify the phrase "$(\emptyset; [\alpha_*])$ is ρ-detected, resp. representation detected", to "$[\alpha_*]$ is ρ-detected, resp. representation detected". Similarly, we simplify "$(\{1, 2, \ldots, r\}; [\alpha_*])$ is ρ-detected, resp. representation detected", to "$[\alpha_*]$ is *strongly* ρ-detected, resp. *strongly* representation detected".

Set

$$\mathcal{D}_{rep}(M; J) = \{[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M) : (J; [\alpha_*]) \text{ is representation detected}\}$$

When $J = \emptyset$ we will often simplify $\mathcal{D}_{rep}(M; J)$ to $\mathcal{D}_{rep}(M)$.

Determining $\mathcal{D}_{rep}(M; J)$ is a subtle problem which was completely resolved in a series of papers by Eisenbud, Hirsch, Neumann, Jankins and Naimi ([EHN], [JN2], [Na]). See Appendix A. The interested reader should also see [CW], and in particular Theorem 3.9 of that paper, for a simpler, more direct approach to these results. One of the main results of this area implies that if $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected, then it is ρ-detected where ρ takes values in a certain family of 3-dimensional Lie groups. We describe this result next.

3.2. **JN-realisability.** For a subset J of $\{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ and an r-tuple $(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r$, we say that $(J; 0; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_r)$ is *JN-realisable* (after Jankins-Neumann) if there is some $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ such that $\tau_j = \tau(\rho(x_j))$ $(1 \leq j \leq r)$ and $\tau(\rho(x_j))$ is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(\tau_j)$ for $j \in J$. (Our notation differs slightly from that of [JN2].) Clearly $(J; 0; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected where $[\alpha_j] = [\tau_j h - h_j^*]$ $(1 \leq j \leq r)$.

More generally, given $J \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r$, we say that $(J; b; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \ldots, \tau_r)$ is *JN-realisable* if there exist $f_1, \ldots, f_n, g_1, \ldots, g_r \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ such that

- f_i is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(\gamma_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$;
- $\tau(g_j) = \tau_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$;
- g_j is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(\tau_j)$ for each $j \in J$;
- $f_1 \circ \ldots \circ f_n \circ g_1 \circ \ldots \circ g_r = \mathrm{sh}(b)$.

If $f_1, \ldots, f_n, g_1, \ldots, g_r$ satisfying these conditions can be chosen to lie in a subgroup $\widetilde{G}$ of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$, we say that $(J; b; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \ldots, \tau_r)$ is *JN-realisable in* $\widetilde{G}$.

A particularly important family of subgroups $\widetilde{G}$ of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ correspond to the universal covers $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ of the k-fold cyclic covers $PSL(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ of $PSL(2,\mathbb{R})$ $(k \geq 1)$. These groups are conjugate in $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$, though not in $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$. More precisely, let $F_k : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the homeomorphism $F_k(x) = kx$. Then

$$\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k = F_k^{-1}\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})F_k$$

Note that $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_1 = \widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$.

The elements of $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ are either *elliptic, parabolic* or *hyperbolic* depending on whether the image in $PSL(2,\mathbb{R})$ of its conjugate by F_k has that property. Thus an element is elliptic if and only if it is

conjugate to a translation. The parabolic and hyperbolic elements of $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ have integral translation numbers, so the translation number of a parabolic or hyperbolic element of $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ is of the form $\frac{d}{k}$ where $d \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 3.4. ([EHN], [JN2], [Na]) *$(J; b; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \dots, \tau_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only if it is JN-realisable in $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ for some $k \geq 1$.*

Proof. The conclusion of this theorem is the substance of [JN2, Conjecture 1] whose proof is a consequence of results contained in [EHN], [JN2], [Na]. See the discussion at the end of [JN2, §1] and [Na, Theorem 1]. □

3.3. **JN-realisability and representation detection.**

Proposition 3.5. *Let $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and suppose that $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal. Then $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected if and only if it is ρ-detected for some $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ with values in some $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$.*

Proof. Since $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal we can find real numbers $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_r$ such that $[\alpha_j] = [\tau_j h - h_j^*]$. Then $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected if and only if $(J; 0; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \dots, \tau_r)$ is JN-realisable and by Theorem 3.4 this is equivalent to it being JN-realisable in $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ for some $k \geq 1$, which is what we had to prove. □

Corollary 3.6. *Suppose that $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected where $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal. Then $(J^\dagger; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected where $J^\dagger = J \cup \{j : [\alpha_j]$ is irrational$\}$.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.5 that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is ρ-detected for some $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ with values in some $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$. In particular $[\alpha_j] = [\alpha_j(\rho)] = [\tau_j(\rho(x_j))h - h_j^*]$. If $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational then so is $\tau_j(\rho(x_j))$. But as $\rho(x_j) \in \widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$, it is therefore elliptic and so is conjugate to a translation. Since $\rho(h) = \mathrm{sh}(1)$, this implies that $\rho(\pi_1(T_j))$ conjugates into the group of translations of $\mathbb{R}$. Thus $[\alpha_j]$ is strongly ρ-detected, which completes the proof. □

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose that $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected where $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal and some $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational. Reindex the boundary components of M so that $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational if and only $1 \leq j \leq s$ and set $J^\dagger = J \cup \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Then for $1 \leq j \leq s$ there is an open sector $U_j \subset \mathcal{S}(T_j)$ containing $[\alpha_j]$ such that one of the following two statements holds.*

(1) *$(J^\dagger; [\alpha'_*])$ is representation detected for all $[\alpha'_*]$ such that $[\alpha'_j] \in U_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq s$ and $[\alpha'_j] = [\alpha_j]$ otherwise.*

(2) *M has no singular fibres, $s = 2$, $J^\dagger = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $[\alpha_j] = [\tau_j h - h_j^*]$ where $\tau_3, \dots, \tau_r \in \mathbb{Z}$. Further, there is a homeomorphism $\varphi : U_1 \to U_2$ which preserves both rational and irrational slopes and for which $(J^\dagger; [\alpha'_*])$ is representation detected for all $[\alpha'_*] = ([\alpha'_1], \varphi([\alpha'_1]), [\alpha_3], \dots, [\alpha_r])$ whenever $[\alpha'_1] \in U_1$.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.6 it suffices to deal with the case that $J^\dagger = J$. Let n be the number of exceptional fibres in M and let r_1 and s_0 be the non-negative integers defined in Appendix A. Note that $r_1 \geq 1$ by hypothesis. If $n + r_1 + s_0 \geq 2$ then Proposition A.4 implies that statement (1) holds. Otherwise $n = s_0 = 0$ and $r_1 = 1$, in which case the proof of Proposition A.3 implies that statement (2) holds. □

4. Detecting slopes via left-orders

4.1. **Left-orders.** Let $\mathfrak{o}$ be a strict total ordering of a group G and use $<$ to denote the associated relation. We say that $\mathfrak{o}$ is a *left-ordering* of G if $<$ is invariant under left multiplication:

$$g < h \Rightarrow fg < fh \text{ for all } f, g, h \in G$$

We call G *left-orderable* if it admits a left-ordering. While the trivial group satisfies the criterion for being left-orderable, we will adopt the convention that it is *not* left-orderable in this paper. We use $LO(G)$ to denote the set of left-orderings on G.

For example, the group $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ is left-orderable [Co] (cf. the proof of Proposition 4.5), as is any of its non-trivial subgroups. Moreover, a countable group is left-orderable if and only if it is isomorphic to a non-trivial subgroup of $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ ([Li]). See Proposition 5.1. A much stronger result holds for many 3-manifold groups: *The fundamental group of a compact $\mathbb{P}^2$-irreducible 3-manifold is left-orderable if and only if it admits an epimorphism to a left-orderable group* ([BRW, Theorem 1.1(1)]). Thus for W a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere, $\pi_1(W)$ is left-orderable if and only if there is a homomorphism $\pi_1(W) \to \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ whose image is non-trivial.

Given $\mathfrak{o} \in LO(G)$, we call an element $g \in G$ $\mathfrak{o}$-*positive*, or simply *positive*, if $g > 1$. Similarly we call g *negative* if $g < 1$. The set $P(\mathfrak{o})$ of $\mathfrak{o}$-positive elements of G is called the *positive cone* of $\mathfrak{o}$, which we simplify by writing P when there is no risk of ambiguity. A left-ordering is uniquely determined by its positive cone, for a subset P of G which is closed under multiplication and for which $G = \{1\} \sqcup P \sqcup P^{-1}$ uniquely determines a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ by defining $g_1 < g_2$ if and only if $g_1^{-1}g_2 \in P$. Evidently $P = P(\mathfrak{o})$.

The *opposite order* of $\mathfrak{o}$ is the order $\mathfrak{o}_{op}$ defined by the subset $P(\mathfrak{o})^{-1}$ of G.

4.2. **Order detection of slopes.** It is elementary to verify the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. ([CR, Lemma 3.3]) *Every left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ determines a unique line $L_\mathfrak{o}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ characterised by the property that all elements of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ lying to one side of $L_\mathfrak{o}$ are positive and all elements lying to the other are negative.* □

It follows that every left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ of the fundamental group of a torus T determines a unique slope $[\alpha(\mathfrak{o})] \in \mathcal{S}(T)$.

Every non-trivial subgroup H of G is left-ordered by the restriction of the ordering $\mathfrak{o}$, which will be denoted by $\mathfrak{o}|H$, or simply $\mathfrak{o}$ when there is no risk of ambiguity. A subgroup C of G is called $\mathfrak{o}$-*convex* if whenever $g_1, g_2 \in C$ and $g_0 \in G$ satisfy $g_1 < g_0 < g_2$, then $g_0 \in C$.

Let M be a Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2. In what follows we consider $\pi_1(T_j) \cong H_1(T_j)$ as a subgroup of $H_1(T_j, \mathbb{R})$, and denote by $\langle \alpha_j \rangle$ the cyclic subgroup of $H_1(T_j, \mathbb{R})$ generated by α_j.

Definition 4.2. Let $\mathfrak{o}$ be a left-ordering of $\pi_1(M)$. A slope $[\alpha_j] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j)$ is *detected* by $\mathfrak{o}$, or $\mathfrak{o}$-*detected*, if $[\alpha_j] = [\alpha(\mathfrak{o}|\pi_1(T_j))]$. In this case we will simply write $[\alpha_j] = [\alpha_j(\mathfrak{o})]$. It is *strongly* $\mathfrak{o}$-*detected* if it is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected and there is an $\mathfrak{o}$-convex, normal subgroup C of $\pi_1(M)$ such that $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$. For $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$, we say that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-*detected* if $[\alpha_j]$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected for all j and there exists a $\mathfrak{o}$-convex, normal subgroup C of $\pi_1(M)$ such that $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for $j \in J$ and $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) \leq \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ otherwise.

We'll often simplify "$(\emptyset; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected, resp. order detected", to "$[\alpha_*]$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected, resp. order detected", and "$(\{1, 2, \dots, r\}; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected, resp. order detected", to "$[\alpha_*]$ is *strongly* $\mathfrak{o}$-detected, resp. order detected".

Set

$$\mathcal{D}_{ord}(M; J) = \{[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M) : (J; [\alpha_*]) \text{ is order detected}\}$$

When $J = \emptyset$ we write $\mathcal{D}_{ord}(M)$ in place of $\mathcal{D}_{ord}(M; J)$.

Remarks 4.3. (1) Order detected irrational slopes are always strongly order detected; if $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational then $\langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \{1\}$ is contained in every convex subgroup C of G. Therefore whenever $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected we can enlarge the set J to create a new set $J^\dagger$ that contains all j for which $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational, and $(J^\dagger; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected.

(2) The reader will verify that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected if and only if it is $\mathfrak{o}_{op}$-detected. Thus if $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is order detected it is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected where $h > 1$.

Lemma 4.4. *Fix $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ and $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ such that $\{j \in J : [\alpha_j] = [h]\} = \emptyset$. Define $J_0 = \{j \in J : [\alpha_j]$ is rational$\}$ and let M' be the Seifert manifold obtained by $[\alpha_j]$-Dehn filling of M where $j \in J_0$. Then $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is order detected in M if and only if $(J'; [\alpha'_*])$ is order detected in M'.*

Proof. Suppose that M' is closed. Then $J_0 = J = \{1, \dots, r\}$, so our assumptions imply that $[\alpha_*]$ is rational and horizontal. If $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected, there is a $\mathfrak{o}$-convex, normal subgroup C of $\pi_1(M)$ such that $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for all j. The quotient homomorphism $\pi_1(M) \to \pi_1(M)/C$ induces a left-order $\mathfrak{o}'$ on $G = \pi_1(M)/C \neq \{1\}$ and factors through an epimorphism $\pi_1(M') \to G$. It follows that $M' \ncong P^3 \# P^3$ and so is prime. Therefore by [BRW, Theorem 1.1], $\pi_1(M')$ is left-orderable. Conversely suppose that $\pi_1(M')$ is left-orderable. Since the kernel of the epimorphism $\pi_1(M) \to \pi_1(M')$ is also left-orderable, we obtain an induced left-order $\mathfrak{o}$ on $\pi_1(M)$. Now the cores of the filling tori in M' cannot be null-homotopic as otherwise M' would be the 3-sphere (see [BRW, Proposition 4.1] for instance). It follows that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected.

Next suppose that M' is not closed. Let $J' = J \setminus J_0$ and let $[\alpha'_*]$ be the projection of $[\alpha_*]$ in $\mathcal{S}(M')$. If $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected, there is a $\mathfrak{o}$-convex, normal subgroup C of $\pi_1(M)$ such that $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for $j \in J$ and $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) \leq \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ otherwise. The quotient homomorphism $\pi_1(M) \to \pi_1(M)/C$ induces a left-order $\bar{\mathfrak{o}}$ on $G = \pi_1(M)/C \neq \{1\}$ and factors through an epimorphism $\pi_1(M') \to G$. Since the kernel of this epimorphism is left-orderable, we obtain an induced left-order $\mathfrak{o}'$ on $\pi_1(M')$ for which $(J'; [\alpha'_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}'$-detected. Conversely if $(J'; [\alpha'_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}'$-detected, we can use the epimorphism $\pi(M) \to \pi_1(M')$ to construct a left-order $\mathfrak{o}$ on $\pi_1(M)$ for which $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected. □

4.3. **Representation detection implies order detection.** Given $\mathfrak{o} \in LO(G)$ and a subgroup $H \subset G$, we call $f \in G$ *$\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal* in H if for all $g \in H$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f^{-n} < g < f^n$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2. Suppose that $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected. Then $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected for some ordering $\mathfrak{o} \in LO(\pi_1(M))$ for which h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $\pi_1(M)$.*

Proof. An enumeration $\{0 = r_1, r_2, r_3, \dots\}$ of the rationals yields a left-order on $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ by taking $f > f'$ if and only if $f(r_{k_0}) > f'(r_{k_0})$ where $k_0 = \min\{k : f(r_k) \neq f'(r_k)\}$. Hence if we fix $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ such that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is ρ-detected, there is an induced left-order $\mathfrak{o}_1$ on image(ρ). Note that as $\rho(h) = \mathrm{sh}(1)$, $\rho(h)$ is $\mathfrak{o}_1$-cofinal in image(ρ). Let $C = \ker(\rho)$ and observe that as C is a subgroup of $\pi_1(M)$, it admits a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}_0$ (cf. [BRW, Theorem 1.1(1)]). The left-orderings $\mathfrak{o}_0$ and $\mathfrak{o}_1$ piece together to form a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ on $\pi_1(M)$ whose positive cone is $P(\mathfrak{o}) = P(\mathfrak{o}_0) \cup \rho^{-1}(P(\mathfrak{o}_1))$. It is clear that C is $\mathfrak{o}$-convex and h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal. We prove that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected next.

Since $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is ρ-detected, $[\alpha_j] = [\tau(\rho(x_j))h - h_j^*]$ for each j. Further, $\rho(\pi_1(T_j))$ conjugates into the group of translations when $j \in J$. Since translation number is an injective homomorphism when restricted to the translation subgroup of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ we find $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \ker(\rho) \cap \pi_1(T_j) \leq \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for all j with equality when $j \in J$. To complete the proof it suffices to show that $[\alpha_j]$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected for all j. To that end, note that the complement of the line containing $\langle \alpha_j \rangle$ in $H_1(T_j; \mathbb{R})$ is the union of two components $H_+ \cup H_-$ where $\tau(\rho(\gamma)) > 0$ for $\gamma \in \pi_1(T_j) \cap H_+$ and $\tau(\rho(\gamma)) < 0$ for $\gamma \in \pi_1(T_j) \cap H_-$. (Here we identify $\pi_1(T_j)$ with $H_1(T_j)$.) It follows that for each k, $\rho(\gamma)(r_k) > r_k$ when $\gamma \in \pi_1(T_j) \cap H_+$ and $\rho(\gamma)(r_k) < r_k$ when $\gamma \in \pi_1(T_j) \cap H_-$. In particular, for $\gamma \in (H_+ \cup H_-) \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ we have $\rho(\gamma) \in P(\mathfrak{o})$ if and only if $\gamma \in H_+ \cap \pi_1(T_j)$. Thus $L_{\mathfrak{o}|\pi_1(T_j)}$ contains $\langle \alpha_j \rangle$, so $[\alpha_j] = [\alpha_j(\mathfrak{o})]$. □

4.4. **Order detection of horizontal $[\alpha_*]$.**

Lemma 4.6. *Let G be a left-ordered group with ordering $\mathfrak{o}$.*

(1) *If $f \in G$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal and positive, then $gfg^{-1} > 1$ for all $g \in G$.*

(2) *Suppose there exists $h \in G$ which is central and $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal. If $f \in G$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal and positive, then gfg^{-1} is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal and positive for all $g \in G$.*

Proof. We first prove (1). Given $g \in G$, suppose $g < 1$. Choose $k > 0$ so that $g^{-1} < f^k$, then $1 < gf^k$, and since g^{-1} is positive $1 < gf^k g^{-1} = (gfg^{-1})^k$. Since the k-th power of gfg^{-1} is positive, $gfg^{-1} > 1$. The case of $g > 1$ is similar.

Now assume that $h \in G$ is central and $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal, we may assume also that $h > 1$. Suppose $g < 1$ and choose k so that $hg^{-1} < f^k$. Then $1 < gh^{-1}f^k$, so $1 < gh^{-1}f^k g^{-1}$ since g^{-1} is positive. Since h is central, we find $h < gf^k g^{-1}$ which implies $h^n < (gf^k g^{-1})^n$ for all $n > 0$. Thus $gf^k g^{-1}$ is both positive and cofinal. As above the case $g > 1$ is similar. □

Proposition 4.7. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold M as in §2.2.*

(1) *Suppose that M has base orbifold $Q(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal. Then $[\alpha_*]$ is not order detected.*

(2) *Suppose that M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected. Then $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal if and only if h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $\pi_1(M)$.*

Proof. First we establish some inequalities that must hold in $\pi_1(M)$.

Suppose that $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal and refer to the presentations of $\pi_1(M)$ given in §2.2.1 and §2.2.2. Set $H = \langle y_1, \dots, y_n, x_1, \dots, x_r, h\rangle \subset \pi_1(M)$. We claim that h is cofinal in H. As h is central in H, it suffices to show that there are integers $c_1, \dots, c_n, d_1, \dots, d_r$ such that $h^{-c_i} < y_i < h^{c_i}$ $(1 \le i \le n)$ and $h^{-d_j} < x_j < h^{d_j}$ $(1 \le j \le r)$. The existence of the c_i is obvious from the relations $y_i^{a_i} = h^{b_i}$. On the other hand, $x_j \in \pi_1(T_j)$ and therefore as $[\alpha_j]$ is horizontal, h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $\pi_1(T_j)$. Thus we can find integers $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_r$ as claimed.

When M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $H = \pi_1(M)$ and it follows that h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal. Conversely, if h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $\pi_1(M)$, it is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $\pi_1(T_j)$ for each j. In particular $[\alpha_j]$ cannot be the fibre slope $[h] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j)$. Thus $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal.

On the other hand when M has base orbifold $Q(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, h is cofinal since the generator z in §2.2.1 satisfies $z^2 = (y_1 \dots y_n x_1 \dots x_r)^{-1} \in H$. By Remark 4.3 (2) we may assume $h > 1$, but then the generators z, h satisfy $zhz^{-1} = h^{-1} < 1$. This is not possible by Lemma 4.6(1). □

4.5. **Order detection of non-horizontal $[\alpha_*]$.** Next we examine the order detectability of a pair $(J; [\alpha_*])$ in the case $[\alpha_*]$ is not horizontal. The main result, Proposition 4.11, is a characterization of the non-horizontal $[\alpha_*]$ which are order detected.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is order detected and that $\{j \in J : [\alpha_j] = [h]\}$ is nonempty. Then $[\alpha_j] = [h]$ for all j.*

Proof. Say that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected. Then there is a convex, normal subgroup C of $\pi_1(M)$ such that $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for $j \in J$ and $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) \le \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ otherwise. Since $\{j \in J : [\alpha_j] = [h]\}$ is nonempty, $C \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ contains h for some, and therefore all, j. Thus $[h]$ is $\mathfrak{o}|\pi_1(T_j)$-detected for all j, which completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose that M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ where $r \ge 2$. If $r = 2$ then there exists a left-ordering of $\pi_1(M)$ detecting $([h], [h])$; if $r \ge 3$ then for each slope $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T_r)$ there exists a left-ordering of $\pi_1(M)$ detecting $(\{r\}; ([h], \dots, [h], [\alpha]))$.*

Proof. If $r = 2$ or if $r \ge 3$ and $[\alpha] = [h]$ then we use the short exact sequence

$$1 \to K \to \pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}^{r-1} \to 1$$

where the epimorphism $\pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}^{r-1}$ is the result of killing the fibre class $h \in \pi_1(M)$ as well as the resulting torsion. Since $h \in K$, though no dual class $x_j \in \pi_1(T_j)$ is, the sequence can be used to create a lexicographic left-ordering of $\pi_1(M)$ that strongly detects $([h], \dots, [h])$.

Assume next that $r \geq 3$ and α is a primitive rational element of $H_1(T_r)$ such that $[\alpha]$ is horizontal. In this case, $\pi_1(M(\alpha))$ is left-orderable since it is the fundamental group of an irreducible 3-manifold of positive first Betti number, and therefore $\pi_1(M)$ admits a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ with $[\alpha_r(\mathfrak{o})] = [\alpha]$. Thus $\pi_1(M)$ can be lexicographically ordered using the sequence $1 \to \langle\langle\alpha\rangle\rangle \to \pi_1(M) \to \pi_1(M(\alpha)) \to 1$ so that $[\alpha_r(\mathfrak{o})] = [\alpha]$ is strongly detected.

On the other hand if $r \geq 3$ and $[\alpha]$ is irrational then we use the topology on $LO(\pi_1(M))$ defined by Sikora [Si]. Recall that a left-order $\mathfrak{o}$ is determined by its positive cone $P(\mathfrak{o}) \subset \pi_1(M)$. Given $x \in \pi_1(M)$, let $U_x = \{P \in LO(\pi_1(M)) : x \in P\}$. Now endow $LO(\pi_1(M))$ with the topology with subbasic open sets $\{U_x : x \in \pi_1(M)\}$. Sikora shows that $LO(\pi_1(M))$ is compact and metrizable in this topology. He also identifies $LO(\pi_1(T_j))$ with a space X which has a circle as a natural quotient and which double covers $\mathcal{S}(T_j) \cong S^1$. (This circle quotient of X is simply the space of oriented slopes in $H_1(T_j;\mathbb{R})$. See [Si, §3].) If H is a non-trivial subgroup of $\pi_1(M)$, the restriction map $LO(\pi_1(M)) \to LO(H)$ is easily seen to be continuous, so taking H to be $\pi_1(T_r)$ we obtain a continuous map $LO(\pi_1(M)) \to \mathcal{S}(T_r)$ whose image contains all rational points. Since $LO(\pi_1(M))$ is compact so is its image in $\mathcal{S}(T_r)$; thus every irrational slope is in the image as well. In particular we may fix $\mathfrak{o} \in LO(\pi_1(M))$ with $[\alpha_r(\mathfrak{o})] = [\alpha]$.

Now since $r \geq 3$ we can construct, as above, a short exact sequence

$$1 \to K \to \pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}^{r-2} \to 1$$

with $h \in K, x_r \in K$ and $x_j \notin K$ for $j = 1, \ldots, r-1$. Use the restriction $\mathfrak{o}|K$ to left-order K, and give $\mathbb{Z}^{r-2}$ an arbitrary ordering. The corresponding lexicographic ordering of $\pi_1(M)$ detects $(\{r\}; ([h], \ldots, [h], [\alpha]))$. □

Lemma 4.10. *Let M_1 and M_2 be compact, connected, irreducible 3-manifolds whose boundaries are unions of tori, say $\partial M_1 = T_1 \cup \cdots \cup T_s$ and $\partial M_2 = T_s \cup \cdots \cup T_r$. Suppose that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is order detected on M_1 and $(K; [\beta_*])$ is order detected on M_2. Set $M = M_1 \cup_\phi M_2$, where $\phi : T_s \to T_s$ is a homeomorphism satisfying $\phi_*([\alpha_s]) = [\beta_s]$. If $s \in J \cap K$, then $((J \cup K) \setminus \{s\}; ([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_{s-1}], [\beta_{s+1}], \ldots, [\beta_r]))$ is order detected on M.*

Proof. First consider the case that $[\alpha_s]$ is rational (cf. [CLW, Theorem 8]). Suppose that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}_1$-detected, and $(K; [\beta_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}_2$-detected. Let $C_i \subset \pi_1(M_i)$ be a normal, $\mathfrak{o}_i$-convex subgroup such that $C_i \cap \pi_1(T_j) \subseteq \langle\alpha_j\rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for all j with equality if $j \in J$ (similarly for all $k \in K$). Each ordering $\mathfrak{o}_i$ descends to an ordering $\mathfrak{o}_i'$ of $\pi_1(M_i)/C_i$.

There is a map $\bar{\phi} : \pi_1(T_s)/\langle\alpha_s\rangle \to \pi_1(T_s)/\langle\beta_s\rangle$ induced by ϕ which we use to amalgamate the left-orderable groups $\pi_1(M_1)/C_1$ and $\pi_1(M_2)/C_2$ along cyclic subgroups. We arrive a short exact sequence

$$1 \to C \to \pi_1(M_1) *_\phi \pi_1(M_2) \to \pi_1(M_1)/C_1 *_{\bar{\phi}} \pi_1(M_2)/C_2 \to 1$$

where the middle term is isomorphic to the fundamental group $\pi_1(M)$. By [BG, Corollary 5.3], the group $\pi_1(M_1)/C_1 *_{\bar{\phi}} \pi_1(M_2)/C_2$ is left-orderable and admits a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}'$ that extends $\mathfrak{o}_1'$ and $\mathfrak{o}_2'$. Using the ordering $\mathfrak{o}'$ and the short exact sequence above to left-order $\pi_1(M)$, we arrive at an ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ of $\pi_1(M)$ detecting the tuple $([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_{s-1}], [\beta_{s+1}], \ldots, [\beta_r])$ of slopes. Moreover, the kernel C is convex in $\mathfrak{o}$ and satisfies $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = C_1 \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for $j < s$ and $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = C_2 \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for $j > s$. Therefore $\mathfrak{o}$ detects $((J \cup K) \setminus \{s\}; ([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_{s-1}], [\beta_{s+1}], \ldots, [\beta_r]))$.

Now consider the case that $[\alpha_s]$ is irrational. Without loss of generality we can assume that $J \cap \{1, 2, \ldots, s-1\}$ and $K \cap \{s+1, s+2, \ldots, r\}$ are empty (cf. Remark 4.3 and Lemma 4.4).

Consider the torus $Z = \mathcal{S}(T_1) \times \ldots \times \mathcal{S}(T_s) \times \ldots \times \mathcal{S}(T_r)$ and the closed compact subset $X = \{([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_{s-1}])\} \times \mathcal{S}(T_s) \times \{([\beta_{s+1}], [\beta_{s+2}], \ldots, [\beta_r])\}$ of Z. As above, there is a continuous map $s : LO(\pi_1(M)) \to Z$ which associates to an element of $LO(\pi_1(M))$ the r-tuple of slopes that it detects on $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_s, \ldots, T_r$. Then $Y = s^{-1}(X)$ is closed and compact in $LO(\pi_1(M))$, so the image of Y in $\mathcal{S}(T_s)$ is closed. If there are rational slopes $[\alpha_s']$ arbitrarily close to $[\alpha_s]$ for which the lemma holds, then $[\alpha_s]$ is contained in the image of Y in $\mathcal{S}(T_s)$, which implies the lemma holds. Otherwise, at least

one of M_1 and M_2, say M_1, is of a very special sort (cf. Propositions 4.5 and A.6). Indeed, in this case M_1' (from Remark 4.3) is just $S^1 \times S^1 \times I$ with boundary $T_1 \cup T_s$ (after reindexing $T_1, \dots, T_{s-1}$). It follows that $[\alpha_1]$ equals $[\alpha_s]$ under the identification $\mathcal{S}(T_1) = \mathcal{S}(T_s)$ induced by M_1'. Thus the order detectability of $(K; [\beta_*])$ combines with the obvious homeomorphism $M \cong M_2$ to complete the proof of the lemma. □

Proposition 4.11. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2 and $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$. Fix $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ such that $\{j \in J : [\alpha_j] = [h]\} = \emptyset$.*

(1) *If M has base orbifold $Q(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ then $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is order detected if and only if $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 1$.*

(2) *If M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 1$ then $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is order detected if and only if $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 2$.*

Proof. Suppose that M has base orbifold $Q(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. By Lemma 4.7(1), if $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is order detected then $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 1$. Assume conversely that $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 1$. If $r = 1$, $[\alpha_*] = [\alpha_1]$ is the fibre class $[h]$. Hence $J = \emptyset$. Since Q is non-orientable, h is the rational longitude of M and therefore $(\{1\}; [h])$ is order detected.

Assume that $r > 1$ and note that M splits along an essential vertical torus T as the union of a Seifert manifold N with base orbifold $Q_0(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and a Seifert manifold M_0 where $\partial M_0 = \partial M \cup T$. It is clear that M_0 has base orbifold a planar surface with $r + 1 \geq 3$ boundary components. If assertion (2) holds, we can combine the case $r = 1$ of the previous paragraph with Lemma 4.10 to deduce that assertion (1) holds. Thus we are reduced to proving assertion (2).

Suppose that M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$, and $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected. Without loss of generality we can suppose that $[\alpha_1] = [h]$. Recall the presentation from §2.2.2 and observe that $\pi_1(M)$ is generated by $y_1, \dots, y_n, x_2, \dots, x_r, h$. Since $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ the slopes $[\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r]$ are horizontal, and we can argue as in the proof of Proposition 4.7 to see that h is cofinal in $\pi_1(M)$. But then $[\alpha_1]$ cannot be the fibre slope, since h is unbounded. Thus $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is not $\mathfrak{o}$-detected when $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$.

Suppose that $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 2$. Without loss of generality we can suppose that $[\alpha_j] = [h]$ for $1 \leq j \leq v([\alpha_*])$ and $[\alpha_j]$ is horizontal for $v([\alpha_*]) + 1 \leq j \leq r$, and $J \subset \{v([\alpha_*]) + 1, \dots, r\}$. Choose an essential vertical torus T cutting M into two pieces M_1 and M_2 where $M_1 \cong P_1 \times S^1$ (P_1 a planar surface) has boundary tori $T_1, \dots, T_{v([\alpha_*])}, T$ and M_2 is a Seifert fibred space with boundary tori $T_{v([\alpha_*])+1}, \dots, T_r, T$. By applying Proposition A.6 and Proposition 4.5 there exists a slope $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T)$ and a left-ordering of $\pi_1(M_2)$ that detects $(J \cup \{r + 1 - v([\alpha_*])\}; ([\alpha_{v([\alpha_*])+1}], \dots, [\alpha_r], [\alpha]))$, and by Lemma 4.9, there exists a left-ordering of $\pi_1(M_1)$ detecting $(\{v([\alpha_*])\}; ([h], \dots, [h], [\alpha]))$. It follows from Lemma 4.10 that $\pi_1(M) \cong \pi_1(M_1) *_{\pi_1(T)} \pi_1(M_2)$ admits a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ detecting $(J; ([h], \dots, [h], [\alpha_{v([\alpha_*])+1}], \dots, [\alpha_r])$. This completes the proof of assertion (2). □

5. Left-orders, dynamic realisations and slopes

We have seen how representations yield orders in a slope preserving fashion. The goal of this section is to reverse this process.

5.1. **The dynamical realisation of a left-ordering.**

We begin with a classic result concerning countable left-orderable groups (cf. [Gh, Theorem 6.8], [Nav, Proposition 2.1]). We include a brief sketch of the proof of the forward implication for later use.

Proposition 5.1. *A non-trivial countable group G is left-orderable if and only if there exists a faithful representation $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the forward implication ([Co]). Suppose that G is left-orderable with ordering $<$ and fix an enumeration $\{g_0, g_1, g_2, \dots\}$ of G with $g_0 = id$. Inductively define an order-preserving

embedding $t : G \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows: Set $t(g_0) = 0$. If $t(g_0), \dots, t(g_i)$ have already been defined and g_{i+1} is either larger or smaller than all previously embedded elements, set:

$$t(g_{i+1}) = \begin{cases} \max\{t(g_0), \dots, t(g_i)\} + 1 & \text{if } g_{i+1} > \max\{g_0, \dots, g_i\} \\ \min\{t(g_0), \dots, t(g_i)\} - 1 & \text{if } g_{i+1} < \min\{g_0, \dots, g_i\} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, if there exist $j, k \in \{0, \dots, i\}$ such that $g_j < g_{i+1} < g_k$ and there is no $n \in \{0, \dots, i\}$ such that $g_j < g_n < g_k$, set $t(g_{i+1}) = \frac{t(g_j)+t(g_k)}{2}$. The group G acts in an order-preserving way on $t(G)$ according to the rule $g(t(h)) = t(gh)$. This action extends uniquely to an order-preserving action of G on the closure $\overline{t(G)}$. Since the complement of $\overline{t(G)}$ is a disjoint union of open intervals whose end-points lie in $\overline{t(G)}$, we can extend the G-action on $\overline{t(G)}$ affinely over $\mathbb{R} \setminus \overline{t(G)}$. This defines a faithful representation $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}} : G \to \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$. □

Definition 5.2. Given a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ of a countable group G, a representation $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}$ constructed as in Proposition 5.1 is called a *dynamical realisation* of $\mathfrak{o}$.

It follows from the method of proof of [Nav, Lemma 2.8] that any two dynamical realisations of a left-orderable group G are conjugate in $\mathrm{Hom}(G, \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R}))$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mathfrak{o}$ be a left-order on a group G and $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}} : G \to \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ a dynamical realisation of $\mathfrak{o}$.*

(1) *The action on $\mathbb{R}$ induced by $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}$ is nontrivial, i.e. there are no global fixed points.*

(2) *An element $g \in G$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal if and only if $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}(g)$ is fixed point free (and if and only if it is conjugate in $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ to $sh(\pm 1)$).*

Proof. Assertion (1) follows from the observation that the set $t(G)$ is unbounded above and below.

Next suppose that $g \in G$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. There is an integer n such that $x \in [t(g^n), t(g^{n+1}))$, so $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}(g)(x) \in [t(g^{n+1}), t(g^{n+2}))$ and therefore $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}(g)(x) \neq x$. Conversely suppose that $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}(g)$ is fixed point free. It follows from the construction of $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}$ that the intersection of $\{t(g^n) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with any bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}$ is finite. Hence g must be $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal. Finally observe that Lemma 3.1(1) implies that an element of $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(\pm 1)$ if and only if it is fix point free. This proves (2). □

5.2. **Left-orders, dynamic realisations and slopes.** The next proposition is a converse to Proposition 4.5.

Proposition 5.4. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2. Suppose that $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected where $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal.*

(1) *If $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}} : \pi_1(M) \to Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$ is a dynamic realisation of $\mathfrak{o}$, then $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}$ is conjugate in $Homeo_+(\mathbb{R})$ to a representation ρ with values in $\widetilde{Homeo}_+(S^1)$. Further, each $[\alpha_j]$ is ρ-detected.*

(2) *$(J; [\alpha_*])$ is ρ'-detected for some $\rho' \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ which takes values in some $\widetilde{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})_k$.*

Proof. First note that if $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal, Proposition 4.7 implies that M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal. Therefore Lemma 5.3 (2) implies that $\rho(h)$ is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(\pm 1)$. Hence $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}$ is conjugate in $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ to a representation ρ with values in $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$.

Fix j and let $L_{\mathfrak{o}} \supset \langle \alpha_j \rangle$ be the line in $H_1(T_j; \mathbb{R})$ determined by $\mathfrak{o}$. By construction, each element of $\pi_1(T_j) \setminus L_{\mathfrak{o}}$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal while

$$t(\{g \in \pi_1(T_j) \setminus L_{\mathfrak{o}} : g > 1\}) = \{t(g) : g \in \pi_1(T_j) \setminus L_{\mathfrak{o}}\} \cap \mathbb{R}_+$$

and

$$t(\{g \in \pi_1(T_j) \setminus L_{\mathfrak{o}} : g < 1\}) = \{t(g) : g \in \pi_1(T_j) \setminus L_{\mathfrak{o}}\} \cap \mathbb{R}_-$$

It follows that $\tau(\rho(g)) > 0$ for all positive $g \in \pi_1(T_j) \setminus L_{\mathfrak{o}}$ and $\tau(\rho(g)) < 0$ for all negative $g \in \pi_1(T_j) \setminus L_{\mathfrak{o}}$. Thus $[\alpha_j]$ is ρ-detected, so assertion (1) holds.

Up to replacing $\mathfrak{o}$ by $\mathfrak{o}_{op}$, we can suppose that h is $\mathfrak{o}$-positive and therefore that $\rho(h) = \mathrm{sh}(1)$. (See Remark 4.3(2).) We shall assume this below.

Fix an $\mathfrak{o}$-convex, normal subgroup C of $\pi_1(M)$ such that $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ for $j \in J$ and $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) \leq \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ otherwise. As C is $\mathfrak{o}$-convex and normal, $\mathfrak{o}$ induces a left-order $\bar{\mathfrak{o}}$ on $\pi_1(M)/C$ by taking the positive cone of $\bar{\mathfrak{o}}$ to be the image in $\pi_1(M)/C$ of the positive cone of $\mathfrak{o}$. The convexity of C implies that $\bar{\mathfrak{o}}$ is a well-defined left-order.

Let $\rho_{\bar{\mathfrak{o}}}$ be a dynamic realisation of $\bar{\mathfrak{o}}$. Since the image of h in $\pi_1(M)/C$ is $\bar{\mathfrak{o}}$-cofinal, we can assume that $\rho_{\bar{\mathfrak{o}}}(hC) = \mathrm{sh}(1)$. Therefore $\bar{\rho} \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ where $\bar{\rho}$ is the composition of the dynamic realisation $\rho_{\bar{\mathfrak{o}}}$ and the quotient $\pi_1(M) \to \pi_1(M)/C$. We claim that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\bar{\rho}$-detected. Fix j and suppose first of all that $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \{1\}$. In this case, $\pi_1(T_j) \to \pi_1(M)/C$ is injective, so the left-orders on $\pi_1(T_j)$ induced from $\mathfrak{o}$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{o}}$ coincide. The method of proof of part (1) of this proposition then shows that $[\alpha_j(\bar{\rho})] = [\alpha_j(\bar{\mathfrak{o}})] = [\alpha_j(\mathfrak{o})] = [\alpha_j]$. On the other hand, if $C \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$, then $\ker(\bar{\rho}) \cap \pi_1(T_j) = \langle \alpha_j \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_j)$ so $[\alpha_j]$ is $\bar{\rho}$-detected for such j. Further, when $[\alpha_j]$ is rational, it is strongly is $\bar{\rho}$-detected. Thus if $J_0 = \{j \in J : [\alpha_j] \text{ is rational}\}$, $(J_0; [\alpha_*])$ is $\bar{\rho}$-detected. Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.6 now show that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is ρ'-detected for some $\rho' \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ which takes values in some $\widetilde{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})_k$. □

Remark 5.5. The methods of this section can be used to show the equivalence of statements (2) and (3) of Theorem 1.3 and of Theorem 1.5. For instance, consider a dynamical realisation $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}$ of a left-order $\mathfrak{o}$ on the fundamental group of a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere W. If $\mathfrak{o}$ satisfies the condition of statement (2) of Theorem 1.3 then Lemma 5.3(2) implies that the image by $\rho_{\mathfrak{o}}$ of the class each Seifert fibre of a piece of W is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(\pm 1)$. Thus statement (3) of Theorem 1.3 holds. If $\mathfrak{o}$ satisfies the condition of statement (2) of Theorem 1.5, then $\pi(W)/C$ admits an induced left-order $\overline{\mathfrak{o}}$ in which the image of the class of each Seifert fibre of a piece of W is cofinal. The composition of the quotient homomorphism $\pi_1(W) \to \pi_1(W)/C$ with a dynamical realisation of $\overline{\mathfrak{o}}$ is a representation which satisfies the condition of statement (3) of Theorem 1.5.

Conversely consider a representation $\rho : \pi_1(W) \to \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ with non-trivial image. It follows from [BRW, Theorem 1.1(1)]) that $\pi_1(W)$ admits a left-ordering and therefore so does $\ker(\rho)$ as long as it is non-trivial. Since $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ is left-orderable, there is a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ on $\pi_1(W)$ induced by the exact sequence $1 \to \ker(\rho) \to \pi_1(W) \to \mathrm{image}(\rho) \to 1$ (cf. the proof of Lemma 4.5). Since $\mathrm{sh}(1)$ is cofinal in the natural left-orderings on $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ (cf. the first paragraph of the proof of [Nav, Proposition 2.1]), the reader will verify that if ρ satisfies statement (3) of Theorem 1.3 then $\mathfrak{o}$ satisfies statement (2) of that theorem. Further if ρ satisfies statement (3) of Theorem 1.5 then $\mathfrak{o}$ satisfies statement (2) of that theorem when we take $C = \ker(\rho)$.

6. Detecting slopes via foliations

Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2. We use $\mathfrak{F}(M)$ to denote the set of isotopy classes of co-oriented, taut foliations on M which are transverse to ∂M. The set of isotopy classes of co-oriented, horizontal foliations on M is contained in $\mathfrak{F}(M)$.

6.1. **Foliation detection of slopes.** For each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{F}(M)$ and $1 \leq j \leq r$, $\mathcal{F}$ determines a co-dimension 1 foliation $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ of T_j which either contains a closed leaf or can be isotoped to be horizontal on T_j. In the latter case we can associate an element $f_j \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ to $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ by taking the holonomy in $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(S^1)$ and lifting to $\widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ using the section determined by x_j (cf. [EHN, page 654]). If f_j is conjugate to a rotation, we call $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ *linear*.

We can define a uniquely determined slope $[\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j)$ as follows:

- if $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ contains a closed leaf, we define $[\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})]$ to be the slope of that leaf.
- if $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ is horizontal we define $[\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})] = [\tau(f_j)h - h_j^*]$.

These definitions coincide when $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ is horizontal and contains a closed leaf.

We call $[\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})] = ([\alpha_1(\mathcal{F})], [\alpha_2(\mathcal{F})], \dots, [\alpha_r(\mathcal{F})])$ the *slope* of $\mathcal{F}$.

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a taut co-oriented foliation in M which is transverse to ∂M. A slope $[\alpha_j] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j)$ is *detected* by $\mathcal{F}$, or $\mathcal{F}$-*detected*, if $[\alpha_j] = [\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})]$. It is *strongly* $\mathcal{F}$-*detected* if it is $\mathcal{F}$-detected and $\mathcal{F}|T_j$ is linear. For $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$, we say that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathcal{F}$-*detected* if $\mathcal{F}$ detects $[\alpha_j]$ for all j and $\mathcal{F}$ strongly detects $[\alpha_j]$ for $j \in J$. Finally, we say that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is *foliation-detected* if it is $\mathcal{F}$-detected for some $\mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{F}(M)$.

We shall often simplify the phrase "$(\emptyset; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathcal{F}$-detected, resp. foliation detected", to "$[\alpha_*]$ is $\mathcal{F}$-detected, resp. foliation detected". Similarly, we simplify "$(\{1, 2, \dots, r\}; [\alpha_*])$ is $\mathcal{F}$-detected, resp. foliation detected", to "$[\alpha_*]$ is *strongly* $\mathcal{F}$-detected, resp. *strongly* foliation detected".

Set

$$\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M; J) = \{[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M) : (J; [\alpha_*]) \text{ is foliation detected}\}$$

When $J = \emptyset$ we simplify $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M; J)$ to $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$.

6.2. Foliations are horizontal if their slopes are horizontal.

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is $\mathcal{F}$-detected. Then $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal if and only if $\mathcal{F}$ is horizontal.*

Proof. We need only consider the forward direction. By possibly passing to a 2-fold cover, we may assume that the base orbifold of M is of the form $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ where P is a planar surface.

Suppose then that $[\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})]$ is horizontal. We can split $\mathcal{F}$ open along finitely many leaves to obtain an essential lamination $\mathcal{L}$ in M which contains a sublamination $\mathcal{L}_0$ which is either vertical or horizontal ([Br1, Theorem 1]). Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_0$ is vertical. After splitting $\mathcal{L}_0$ along its leaves which contain exceptional fibres of M, we may assume that it is a vertical lamination in the exterior M_0 of the exceptional fibres of M. Then $M_0 \cong P_0 \times S^1$ where P_0 is the exterior of the cone points of $P(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$. Since $\mathcal{L}_0$ is vertical, it projects to a 1-dimensional lamination L_0 in P_0. Further, since a compressing or end-compressing disk for a leaf of L_0 in P_0 is also one for $\mathcal{L}_0$ in M, L_0 is incompressible in P_0. As $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal, L_0 is contained in the interior of P_0.

Let $\tau \subset \text{int}(P_0)$ be an incompressible train track which fully carries L_0. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is co-oriented, so is L_0 and therefore the branches of τ can be coherently oriented. Thus, any embedded loop in τ consists of a sequence of coherently oriented branches. Each such loop separates P_0 and so we can choose one, say C, such that P_0 splits as the union of two subsurfaces Q_0, Q_1 such that $Q_0 \cap Q_1 = C$ and $\tau \cap \text{int}(Q_0) = \emptyset$. Since τ is essential, there is a point $x \in \text{int}(Q_0) \setminus L_0$. Given an arc in Q_0 which is transverse to L_0 and connects a point of C to x, it contains a unique point y "closest" to x, and it is not hard to see that the leaf of L which passes through y must be a simple closed curve. The inverse image of this leaf in M_0 is a separating torus leaf of $\mathcal{L}_0$, which contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{F}$ is taut and co-oriented. Thus $\mathcal{L}_0$ horizontal. If it contains no compact leaves, [Br1, Proposition 4] implies that $\mathcal{L}$, and therefore $\mathcal{F}$, is horizontal in M. Otherwise $\mathcal{L}_0$ contains a compact leaf, necessarily non-separating, which is therefore a fibre in a locally-trivial fibring of M over the circle. If $\mathcal{F}$ is not horizontal, (the proof of) [Br1, Proposition 5] shows that it contains a Reeb sublamination with horizontal boundary consisting of annuli, contrary to the fact that $\mathcal{F}$ is co-oriented. Thus $\mathcal{F}$ is horizontal. □

6.3. Representation detection and foliation detection.

The relations between horizontal foliations in Seifert manifolds and representations with values in $\widetilde{\text{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ was worked out in detail in [EHN]. We summarize this work in the context of detected slopes below.

Proposition 6.3. ([EHN]) *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2. Suppose that $J \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal. Then $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is representation detected if and only if it is foliation detected.*

Proof. Suppose that $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is ρ-detected for some $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$. By Proposition 3.5 we can suppose that ρ takes values in $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ for some $k \geq 1$. A standard construction associates a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ on M to ρ, which we describe next.

Let $X \to P(a_1,a_2,\dots,a_n)$ be the universal cover so that $\mathrm{int}(X) \cong \mathbb{R}^2$. Then $\pi_1(M)$ acts properly discontinuously on X via the quotient homomorphism $\varphi : \pi_1(M) \to \pi_1(P(a_1,a_2,\dots,a_n))$ and freely and properly discontinuously on $X \times \mathbb{R}$ via

$$\gamma \cdot (x,t) = (\varphi(\gamma)(x), \rho(\gamma)(t))$$

since $\rho(h) = \mathrm{sh}(1)$. Consider the quotient $M' = X \times_\rho \mathbb{R} = (X \times \mathbb{R})/\pi_1(M)$. Then M' is a 3-manifold whose fundamental group is isomorphic to the group of deck transformations of the cover $X \times \mathbb{R} \to M'$, which is $\pi_1(M)$ acting on $X \times \mathbb{R}$ as above. This determines an identification $\pi_1(M') = \pi_1(M)$. Observe that the image of each $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}$ in M' is a circle, so M' is Seifert fibred in a natural way. Now (x,t) and (x',t') map to the same fibre of M' if and only if $x' = \varphi(\gamma)(x)$ for some $\gamma \in \pi_1(M') = \pi_1(M)$. Thus the base orbifold $\mathcal{B}'$ of M' is the quotient of X by $\pi_1(P(a_1,a_2,\dots,a_n))$. In other words, $\mathcal{B}' = P(a_1,a_2,\dots,a_n)$. Further, the action of $\pi_1(M')$ on X induced by the quotient $\varphi' : \pi_1(M') \to \pi_1(\mathcal{B}')$ coincides with the action of $\pi_1(M)$ on X under the φ-action. It follows that $M' \cong M$. (This is because the Seifert invariant of the i^{th} Seifert fibre is determined by the action of $\varphi(x_i)$ on X: a_i is the order of $\varphi(x_i)$ while b_i is the unique integer in the interval $(0,a_i)$ such that $\varphi(x_i^{b_i})$ acts by rotation by $2\pi/a_i$ about the fixed point of $\varphi(x_i)$ in X.) Finally observe that M', and therefore M, inherits a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ from the foliation $\{X \times \{t\} : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of $X \times \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\widetilde{L}_j$ be the component of ∂X such that $\widetilde{T}_j = \widetilde{L}_j \times \mathbb{R}$ is the $\pi_1(T_j)$-invariant component of $\partial(X \times \mathbb{R})$. Fix an identification $\widetilde{L}_j = \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi(h_j^*)(x) = x+1$ for all $x \in \widetilde{L}_j$. Assume first that $\rho(\pi_1(T_j))$ conjugates into the group of translations of $\mathbb{R}$. Then after conjugation, for $(x,t) \in \widetilde{T}_j$ we have $h \cdot (x,t) = (x,t+1)$ and $h_j^* \cdot (x,t) = (x+1, t+\tau(\rho(h_j^*)))$. It is well known (cf. [CC1, Example 1.2.4 and Exercise 1.2.6]) that $\mathcal{F}(\rho)|_{T_j}$ is a linear foliation of slope $[\tau(\rho(h_j^*))h - h_j^*] = [\alpha_j(\rho)]$. Thus $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ strongly detects $[\alpha_j]$ for $j \in J$. Suppose now that $\rho(\pi_1(T_j))$ does not conjugate into the group of translations of $\mathbb{R}$. It follows from the conventions set in §6 that $[\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})] = [\tau(\rho(h_j^*))h - h_j^*] = [\alpha_j(\rho)] = [\alpha_j]$. Thus $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$-detected.

Conversely suppose that $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is $\mathcal{F}$-detected. Since $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal, so is $\mathcal{F}$ (Proposition 6.2). Let $\widetilde{M} \to M$ be a universal cover and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ the lift of $\mathcal{F}$ to $\widetilde{M}$. Then the preimage in $\widetilde{M}$ of any Seifert fibre of M intersects each leaf of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ once and only once. (See [Br2, §3] for instance.) It follows that the leaf space of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is homeomorphic to the real line, so $\pi_1(M)$ acts on $\mathbb{R}$. As $\mathcal{F}$ is co-oriented, this action is by orientation-preserving homeomorphisms. Further, h acts by $\mathrm{sh}(1)$, at least up to conjugation and an appropriate orientation on $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Let $\rho : \pi_1(M) \to \widetilde{\mathrm{Homeo}}_+(S^1)$ be the associated homomorphism. It follows from our conventions that $[\alpha_*(\rho)] = [\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})] = [\alpha_*]$. If $j \in J$, then $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ is linear, which implies that $\rho(x_j)$ is conjugate to a translation. Hence $\rho|\pi_1(T_j)$ conjugates into the subgroup of translations of $\mathbb{R}$ so that ρ strongly detects $[\alpha_j]$. This completes the proof. □

6.4. **Foliation detection and non-horizontal $[\alpha_*]$.** Our first lemma shows that a vertical slope can rarely be strongly foliation detected.

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \in \mathfrak{F}(M)$ and $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ is a foliation by simple closed curves. Then either $[\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})]$ is horizontal or M is a twisted I-bundle over the Klein bottle with base orbifold a Möbius band. In the latter case we can alter the Seifert structure on M so that $[\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})]$ becomes horizontal.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ is a foliation by simple closed curves of slope $[h_j]$. Let M' be the manifold obtained by Dehn filling M along its fibre slope on T_j. If M has base orbifold of the form $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, then M' is homeomorphic to $(\#_{i=1}^n L_{a_i}) \# (\#_{j=1}^{r-1} S^1 \times D^2)$. On the other hand, M' admits a co-oriented taut foliation and so is either prime or $S^2 \times I$ (see e.g. [CC2, Corollary 9.1.9]). The latter is clearly impossible. Therefore M is prime and so $n+(r-1) \leq 1$. But then M is either a solid torus or $S^1 \times S^1 \times I$, which contradicts our assumptions. Similarly if M has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, M' is homeomorphic

to $(\#_{i=1}^{n} L_{a_i})\#(S^1\times S^2)\#(\#_{j=1}^{r-1} S^1\times D^2)$ so as it is prime, $n = r-1 = 0$. Hence M is a twisted I-bundle over the Klein bottle with the Seifert structure having base orbifold a Möbius band. After changing the structure on M to that with base orbifold $D^2(2,2)$, $[\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})]$ becomes horizontal. Thus the lemma holds. □

Here is the main result of this section.

Proposition 6.5. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold M as in §2.2 and $J \subseteq \{1,\dots,r\}$. Fix $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ and suppose that $j \in J$ implies that $[\alpha_j] \neq [h]$.*

(1) *If M has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, then $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected if and only if $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 1$.*

(2) *If M has base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and $v([\alpha_*]) > 0$, then $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected if and only if $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 2$.*

Proof. We use C_j to denote the image of T_j in the base orbifold of M. Without loss of generality we suppose that $[\alpha_j] = [h]$ if and only if $1 \leq j \leq v([\alpha_*])$. Then $J \subset \{v([\alpha_*])+1,\dots,r\}$.

First assume that M has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$. If $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$ and $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is $\mathcal{F}$-detected, then $\mathcal{F}$ is horizontal by Proposition 6.2. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is also co-oriented, it determines a coherent orientation on the Seifert fibres of M. But this implies that Q is orientable, which is false. Thus $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is not foliation detected.

Suppose then that $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 1$ and let M_0 be a connected manifold obtained by cutting M open along disjoint vertical annuli $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{v([\alpha_*])-1}$ where A_0 is non-separating and connects T_1 to itself and A_i connects T_i and T_{i+1} for $1 \leq i \leq v([\alpha_*]) - 1$. Then M_0 is Seifert with base orbifold $P_0(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ where P_0 is planar with $|\partial P_0| = r - v([\alpha_*]) + 1$. We can write $\partial M_0 = T_0 \cup T_{v([\alpha_*])+1} \cup \dots \cup T_r$ where T_0 is a torus containing $2v([\alpha_*])$ disjoint vertical annuli $A_0^+, A_0^-, A_1^+, A_1^-, \dots, A_{v([\alpha_*])-1}^+, A_{v([\alpha_*])-1}^-$ indexed so that A_j^+ and A_j^- are identified by a homeomorphism f_j in reconstructing M from M_0. We can find a horizontal slope $[\alpha_0]$ on T_0 and a representation ρ_0 which detects $(\{0\}\cup J; ([\alpha_0], [\alpha_{v([\alpha_*])+1}], \dots, [\alpha_r]))$ (Proposition A.4). By Proposition 6.3, there is a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}_0$ in M_0 which detects $(\{0\} \cup J; ([\alpha_0], [\alpha_{v([\alpha_*])+1}], \dots, [\alpha_r]))$. Then $\mathcal{F}_0 \cap A_j^{\pm}$ is a foliation by horizontal arcs and we can assume that f_j preserves this foliation. Then $\mathcal{F}_0$ determines a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}_1$ in M which is transverse to the annuli A_j and detects $[\alpha_j]$ on T_j for $v([\alpha_*])+1 \leq j \leq r$. Note that f_0 reverses the transverse orientation of the leaves of $\mathcal{F}_1$ while $f_1, \dots, f_{v([\alpha_*])}$ preserves them, so $\mathcal{F}_1$ is not co-oriented. But spinning $\mathcal{F}_1$ vertically around $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{v([\alpha_*])-1}$ in an appropriate fashion produces a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}$ which detects $(J;[\alpha_*])$ (cf. [Ca2, Example 4.9]). This completes the proof of (1).

Now assume that M has base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$. Assume first that $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ and $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is $\mathcal{F}$-detected. Without loss of generality we may assume that $[\alpha_1] = [h]$. We can assume that each leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ is either horizontal or vertical ([Br1]). Our assumptions imply that there is a vertical leaf which intersects T_1 and no other T_j. Its closure in M is a vertical sublamination $\mathcal{L}_0$ of $\mathcal{F}$. As in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we may assume that $\mathcal{L}_0$ is the inverse image in M of an incompressible lamination L_0 contained in the exterior P_0 of the cone points of $P(a_1,a_2,\dots,a_n)$ and that $\tau \subset \mathrm{int}(P_0)$ is an incompressible train track which fully carries L_0 whose branches admit a coherent orientation. By construction, $\tau \cap \partial P_0 = \tau \cap C_1 \neq \emptyset$. Hence if τ contains loops, we can find an embedded one, say C, such that P_0 splits as the union of two subsurfaces Q_0, Q_1 such that $Q_0 \cap Q_1 = C$ and $\tau \cap \mathrm{int}(Q_0) = \emptyset$. This leads to a contradiction as in the proof of Proposition 6.2. Hence combinatorially, τ is a tree whose extrema are contained in C_1. But then there is an arc A in τ which splits P_0 as the union of two subsurfaces Q_0, Q_1 such that $Q_0 \cap Q_1 = A$ and $\tau \cap \mathrm{int}(Q_0) = \emptyset$. Arguing as in our previous case shows that $\mathcal{L}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}$ has a separating annular leaf, contrary to the fact that $\mathcal{F}$ is taut and co-oriented. Thus $(J;[\alpha_*])$ cannot be $\mathcal{F}$-detected when $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$.

Suppose next that M has base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 2$. Fix $J \subset \{1,2,\dots,r\}$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ such that $j \in J$ implies that $[\alpha_j] \neq [h]$. Without loss of generality we can suppose that

$[\alpha_j] = [h]$ if and only if $1 \leq j \leq v([\alpha_*])$. Then $J \subset \{v([\alpha_*])+1, \dots, r\}$. Let M_0 be a connected manifold obtained by cutting M open along disjoint vertical annuli $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{v([\alpha_*])-1}$ where A_i connects T_i and T_{i+1}. Then M_0 is Seifert with base orbifold $P_0(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ where P_0 is planar with $|\partial P_0| = r - v([\alpha_*]) + 1$. We can write $\partial M_0 = T_0 \cup T_{v([\alpha_*])+1} \cup \dots \cup T_r$ where T_0 is a torus containing $2v([\alpha_*]) - 2$ disjoint vertical annuli $A_1^+, A_1^-, \dots, A_{v([\alpha_*])-1}^+, A_{v([\alpha_*])-1}^-$ indexed so that $A_j^\pm$ are identified by a homeomorphism f_j in reconstructing M from M_0. We can find a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}_0$ in M_0 which detects some $(\{0\} \cup J; [\beta_*])$ where $[\beta_j] = [\alpha_j]$ for $v([\alpha_*]) + 1 \leq j \leq r$. Then $\mathcal{F}_0 \cap A_j^\pm$ is a foliation by horizontal arcs and we can assume that f_j preserves this foliation. Then $\mathcal{F}_0$ determines a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}_1$ in M which is transverse to the annuli A_j and detects $[\alpha_j]$ on T_j for $v([\alpha_*]) + 1 \leq j \leq r$. Spinning $\mathcal{F}_1$ vertically around these annuli produces a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}$ which detects $(J; [\alpha_*])$. This completes the proof of (2). □

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose that $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected where some $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational. Reindex the boundary components of M so that $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational if and only $1 \leq j \leq s$. Set $J^\dagger = J \cup \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Then for $1 \leq j \leq s$ there is an open sector $U_j \subset \mathcal{S}(T_j)$ containing $[\alpha_j]$ such that one of the following two statements holds.*

(1) *$(J^\dagger; [\alpha'_*])$ is foliation detected for all $[\alpha'_*]$ such that $[\alpha'_j] \in U_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq s$ and $[\alpha'_j] = [\alpha_j]$ otherwise.*

(2) *M has no singular fibres, $s = 2$, $J^\dagger = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal with $[\alpha_j] = [\tau_j h - h_j^*]$ where $\tau_3, \dots, \tau_r \in \mathbb{Z}$. Further, there is a homeomorphism $\varphi : U_1 \to U_2$ which preserves both rational and irrational slopes and for which $(J^\dagger; [\alpha'_*])$ is foliation detected for all $[\alpha'_*] = ([\alpha'_1], \varphi([\alpha'_1]), [\alpha_3], \dots, [\alpha_r])$ whenever $[\alpha'_1] \in U_1$.*

Proof. If $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal this is a consequence of Proposition 6.3 and Corollary 3.7. On the other hand, if $v([\alpha_*]) > 0$ conclusion (1) holds by Proposition 6.5. □

6.5. **Controlling boundary behaviour.** Our goal in this section is to show that we can choose our foliations to display standardized behaviour on the boundary components of M. This will be prove crucial in the proof of Theorem 9.5.

Here is a consequence of Proposition 6.3 and its proof combined with Proposition A.8.

Proposition 6.7. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2 and fix a horizontal $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ and $J \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. If $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected, then it is $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$-detected where ρ takes values in $\widetilde{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})_k$ for some $k \geq 1$. Further, we can suppose that for each j, $\rho(\pi_1(T_j))$ contains no parabolics.* □

Thus each horizontal $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M; J)$ is detected by some $\mathcal{F}$ where for each i, $\mathcal{F} \cap T_i$ is a suspension foliation of either a rotation, and so is a circle fibration of slope $[\alpha_i(\mathcal{F})]$ (this always happens if $j \in J$), or a hyperbolic element g_i of some $\widetilde{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})_k$. In the latter case, $\mathcal{F} \cap T_j$ has a non-zero even number of closed leaves, each of slope $[\alpha_i(\mathcal{F})]$, and g_i is alternately increasing or decreasing in the complementary intervals of the fixed points of g_i.

For an orientation-preserving homeomorphism $f : S^1 \to S^1$, let $T(f) \cong S^1 \times S^1$ denote its mapping torus $(S^1 \times I)/((x, 1) \equiv (f(x), 0))$ and let $\mathcal{F}(f)$ denote its suspension foliation on $T(f)$.

Definition 6.8. (1) For each positive integer k let $IH^0(k)$ be the set of orientation-preserving homeomorphisms $f : S^1 \to S^1$ whose fixed point set consists of $2k$ disjoint closed non-degenerate intervals and for which f is alternately increasing or decreasing on the $2k$ complementary open intervals.

(2) For a positive integer k we say that a codimension one foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on a torus T is *k interval-hyperbolic* if it is homeomorphic to the suspension foliation $\mathcal{F}(f)$ on $T(f)$ of a homeomorphism $f \in IH^0(k)$. The *slope* of a k interval-hyperbolic foliation on T is the slope of its closed leaves.

Lemma 6.9. (1) *Let $f \in IH^0(k)$. Then the foliation $\mathcal{F}(f)$ on $T(f)$ is invariant up to isotopy under any homeomorphism of $T(f)$ which leaves the slope of $\mathcal{F}(f)$ invariant.*

(2) *Two k interval-hyperbolic foliations of the same slope on a torus T are isotopic.*

Proof. (1) Let α be a primitive class in $H_1(T(f))$ representing the slope of $\mathcal{F}(f)$ and $\alpha^* \in H_1(T(f))$ a primitive class carried by the image of $S^1 \times \{0\}$ in $T(f)$. Then α^* is dual to α. Use the ordered basis $\{\alpha, \alpha^*\}$ of $H_1(T(f))$ to identify the mapping class group of $T(f)$ with $GL(2,\mathbb{Z})$ in the usual way. Then a homeomorphism of $T(f)$ which leaves $[\alpha]$ invariant corresponds to a matrix of the form $\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon & b \\ 0 & \delta \end{pmatrix}$ where $\epsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}$. As this matrix factors $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \delta b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{F}(f)$ on $T(f)$ is invariant up to isotopy under the homeomorphisms corresponding to the matrices $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$.

To that end, first observe that $\mathcal{F}(f)$ is invariant up to isotopy by a Dehn twist of slope $[\alpha]$ (i.e. simply perform the Dehn twist in one of the annuli composed of circle leaves of $\mathcal{F}$) and that the matrix of such a Dehn twist is $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Next observe that $IH^0(k)$ is a conjugacy class of elements of $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(S^1)$. (See the discussion on page 355 of [Gh] for instance.) In particular there is an $h \in \mathrm{Homeo}_+(S^1)$ such that $f^{-1} = hfh^{-1}$. Then if $[x,t]$ denotes the class of (x,t) in $T(f)$, the correspondence $[x,t] \mapsto [h(x), 1-t]$ determines a homeomorphism of $T(f)$ which leaves $\mathcal{F}(f)$ invariant and which corresponds to the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Finally note that if r is an orientation-reversing homeomorphism of S^1 then $rfr^{-1} \in IH^0(k)$. Thus there is some $h \in \mathrm{Homeo}_+(S^1)$ such that $rfr^{-1} = hfh^{-1}$. Hence if $r_1 = h^{-1}r$, then r_1 is orientation-reversing and $f = r_1 f r_1^{-1}$. The correspondence $[x,t] \mapsto [r_1(x), t]$ determines a homeomorphism of $T(f)$ which leaves $\mathcal{F}(f)$ invariant and which corresponds to the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$. This completes the proof of (1).

(2) Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ be k interval-hyperbolic foliations of slope $[\alpha]$ on a torus T and fix homeomorphisms $f_1, f_2 \in IH^0(k)$ and $\varphi_1 : (T(f_1), \mathcal{F}(f_1)) \to (T, \mathcal{F}_1)$ and $\varphi_2 : (T(f_2), \mathcal{F}(f_2)) \to (T, \mathcal{F}_2)$. Fix $h \in \mathrm{Homeo}_+(S^1)$ such that $f_2 = hf_1h^{-1}$ and note that the correspondence $[x,t] \mapsto [h(x), t]$ determines a homeomorphism $\psi : (T(f_1), \mathcal{F}(f_1)) \to (T(f_2), \mathcal{F}(f_2))$. By construction, the composition $\theta = \varphi_2 \circ \psi \circ \varphi_1^{-1} : (T, \mathcal{F}_1) \xrightarrow{\cong} (T, \mathcal{F}_2)$. Since $\theta([\alpha]) = [\alpha]$, part (1) of the lemma implies that $\mathcal{F}_1$ is isotopic to $\theta(\mathcal{F}_1) = \mathcal{F}_2$. □

Lemma 6.10. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is a horizontal foliation in M without compact leaves such that $[\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})]$ is rational. There is a constant $k(\mathcal{F}) > 0$ such that for positive integers $k \geq k(\mathcal{F})$ there is a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ in M such that $[\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})]$ is $\mathcal{F}'$-detected and $\mathcal{F}'$ is k interval-hyperbolic on each component of ∂M.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may suppose that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\rho)$ where $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ takes values in some $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ and $\rho(\pi_1(T_i))$ contains no parabolics for each i. (See Proposition 6.7.) Then $\mathcal{F} \cap T_i$ is a suspension foliation of an elliptic or hyperbolic element f of $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$. In the first case, $\mathcal{F} \cap T_i$ is a circle fibration of slope $[\alpha_i(\mathcal{F})]$. In the latter, f has an even number $2k_i > 0$ of fixed points and is alternately increasing or decreasing on the $2k_i$ complementary open intervals. Further, $\mathcal{F} \cap T_i$ has exactly $2k_i$ compact leaves $C_{i1}, C_{i2}, \ldots, C_{i2k_i}$, each of slope $[\alpha_i(\mathcal{F})]$. If $\mathcal{F} \cap T_i$ is a circle fibration, set $k_i = 0$ and choose a circle fibre C_{i1}. Define $k(\mathcal{F}) = \max\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$.

Let $L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_s$ be the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ which contain some C_{ij} and choose half-lines a_{ij} based on C_{ij} $(1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq k_i)$ which are properly-embedded and disjoint in $L_1 \cup L_2 \cup \ldots \cup L_s$. Now replace $\mathcal{F}$ by a foliation obtained by thickening $L_1 \cup L_2 \cup \ldots \cup L_s$ (cf. [Ga1, Operation 2.1.1]). Finally, use the half-lines to create appropriate holonomy (cf. [Ga2, Operation 2.2]) along an appropriate number of

the parallel copies of the leaves $L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_s$ in the thickened neighbourhoods to produce the desired horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ in M. □

Lemma 6.11. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is a horizontal foliation in M with a compact leaf F.*

(1) *If $|\partial M| \geq 2$ then for any positive integer $k \geq 0$ there is a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ in M such that $[\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})]$ is $\mathcal{F}'$-detected and $\mathcal{F}'$ is k interval-hyperbolic on T_j for all j.*

(2) *Suppose that $|\partial M| = 1$ and $|\partial F| \geq 2$.*

(*a*) *If $|\partial F| \geq 3$ then for any integer $k \geq 1$ there is a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ in M such that $[\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})]$ is $\mathcal{F}'$-detected and $\mathcal{F}'$ is k interval-hyperbolic on T_1.*

(*b*) *If $|\partial F| = 2$ then for any odd integer $k \geq 1$ there is a horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ in M such that $(J; [\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})])$ is $\mathcal{F}'$-detected and $\mathcal{F}'$ is k interval-hyperbolic on T_1.*

(3) *Suppose that $|\partial M| = |\partial F| = 1$. Then $[\partial F]$ is contained in an open subset U of $\mathcal{S}(M)$ each slope of which is strongly detected.*

Proof. Let F be a compact leaf of $\mathcal{F}$. Then M fibres over the circle with fibre F in such a way that for each boundary component T_i of M, the induced fibration of T_j is by simple closed curves of slope $[\alpha_j(\mathcal{F})]$. Without loss of generality we suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is this fibration. If $|\partial M| \geq 2$ or $|\partial M| = 1$ and and $|\partial F \cap \partial M| \geq 2$, we can repeat the argument of the previous lemma by replacing the half-lines by properly-embedded arcs contained in separate fibres and running between distinct boundary components of the fibre. Choosing the appropriate number of such arcs appropriately placed in F yields assertions (1) and (2) of the lemma.

Now we prove assertion (3). First we claim that $\mathcal{T}(M) := \mathcal{T}(M; \emptyset; \emptyset)$ (cf. the Appendix) has a non-empty interior. Otherwise Proposition A.4(4) implies that $\mathcal{T}(M) = \mathcal{T}_{str}(M) = \{[\lambda_M]\}$, M has two exceptional fibres, and $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 1$. Thus there are coprime integers $1 \leq b < a$ such that $\gamma_1 = \frac{b}{a}$ and $\gamma_2 = \frac{a-b}{a}$. A homological calculation then shows that the rational longitude of M has order $a > 1$ in $H_1(M)$ (cf. §2.2.2), contrary to our assumption that $|\partial F| = 1$. Thus the interior of $\mathcal{T}(M)$ is non-empty and coincides with $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M)$ (Proposition A.4(4)). Since $[\lambda_M] \in \mathcal{T}_{str}(M)$, we are done. □

Lemma 6.12. *Suppose that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is rational and foliation detected where $v([\alpha_*]) > 0$ is even if M has orientable base orbifold and odd otherwise.*

(1) *If M has an orientable base orbifold, then for each $k \geq 1$ there is a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ on M which detects $[\alpha_*]$ such that $\mathcal{F}' \cap T_i$ is k interval-hyperbolic for all i.*

(2) *If M has a non-orientable base orbifold, then for each odd $k \geq 1$, there is a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ on M which detects $[\alpha_*]$ such that $\mathcal{F}' \cap T_i$ is k interval-hyperbolic for all i.*

In either case, $\mathcal{F}'$ can be chosen to be transverse to any finite family of Seifert fibres of M.

Proof. Without loss of generality, $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_v$ are the boundary components T_i of M for which $[\alpha_i] = [h]$. Consider a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on M which detects $(\{v+1, \ldots, r\}; [\alpha_*])$, as constructed in the proof of Proposition 6.5. The only compact leaves in the resulting foliation are a finite number of vertical annuli, and we can assume that they avoid any predetermined, finite family of Seifert fibres.

In the case that the base orbifold of M is orientable, v is even, say $v = 2s$. By construction, there are disjoint, vertical, annular leaves $A_1, \ldots, A_s$ of $\mathcal{F}$ where A_i runs between T_{2i-1} and T_{2i}. After thickening these leaves (avoiding the finite set of Seifert fibres), we can add holonomy as in the proof of Lemma 6.11 to create k interval-hyperbolic on T_i for $1 \leq i \leq v$. The only compact leaves in the resulting foliation are vertical annuli parallel to $A_1, \ldots, A_s$, so we can use the construction of Lemma 6.10 (avoiding, again, the finite set of Seifert fibres) to introduce k interval-hyperbolic behaviour on T_i for $v+1 \leq i \leq r$.

A similar construction works in the case that the base orbifold of M is non-orientable. By hypothesis, v is odd, say $v = 2s+1$. There are disjoint, vertical, annular leaves $A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_s$ of $\mathcal{F}$ where A_0 is

non-separating and runs from T_1 to T_1, while A_i runs between T_{2i-1} and T_{2i}. We can create k interval-hyperbolic behaviour on T_i for arbitrary $k \geq 1$ and $2 \leq i \leq r$. One the other hand, we can only create k interval-hyperbolic behaviour on T_1 for odd $k \geq 1$ using A_0. Again these constructions can be arranged so that the resulting foliation is transverse to any finite family of Seifert fibres of M. □

Here is a consequence of the previous three lemmas which will be applied to study slope detection via Heegaard-Floer homology. It can be considered a special case of Theorem 9.5. Recall the definition of the Seifert manifolds N_t from §2.2.3.

Proposition 6.13. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2, $J \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, suppose that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is rational and let $t \geq 2$ be an arbitrary integer. Let W_t be obtained by the $[\alpha_j]$ Dehn filling of M for $j \in J$ and by gluing N_t to M along T_j in such a way that for each $j \notin J$, h_0 is identified with $[\alpha_j]$. Then W_t admits a co-oriented, taut foliation if and only if $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M; J)$.*

Proof. Let M' be the Seifert manifold obtained by the $[\alpha_j]$ Dehn filling of M for $j \in J$ and $[\alpha'_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M')$ the projection of $[\alpha_*]$.

First suppose that M' is closed (i.e. $J = \{1, \dots, r\}$) and therefore coincides with the manifold W_t. If $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M; J) = \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M; \{1, \dots, r\})$, any foliation $\mathcal{F}$ which detects $(J; [\alpha_*])$ restricts to a fibration by simple closed curves of slope $[\alpha_j]$ on T_j for each j. Since the fibration of the solid torus by 2-disks restricts to a fibring of its boundary by simple closed curves of meridional slope, $\mathcal{F}$ extends in the obvious way to a co-oriented, taut foliation of $M' = W$. Conversely suppose that M' admits a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}'$. A similar argument to that used in the proof of Proposition 6.2 shows that $\mathcal{F}'$ is horizontal. Hence, after an isotopy we can suppose that the intersection of $\mathcal{F}'$ with M is a co-oriented, taut foliation of M which strongly detects $[\alpha_*]$. Thus $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M; J)$.

Assume next that $\partial M' \neq \emptyset$ and observe that W_t is obtained by attaching manifolds N_t to components of $\partial M'$ in such a way that $[h_0]$ is identified with $[\alpha'_j]$. Further, since any co-oriented taut foliation on M' which detects $[\alpha'_*]$ is horizontal (cf. Proposition 6.2), it is easy to verify that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M; J)$ if and only if $[\alpha'_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M')$. Hence it suffices to prove the proposition in the case that $J = \emptyset$. We assume this below.

Suppose that W_t admits a co-oriented, taut foliation $\mathcal{F}_W$. After an isotopy we can suppose that $\mathcal{F}_W$ is transverse to each T_j and intersects M and each of the attached N_t in co-oriented taut foliations. (See the discussion after the statement of Proposition 1 of [BNR].) It follows from Proposition A.4 that $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(N_t) = \{[h_0]\}$ for all t, so if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_W \cap M$, then $[\alpha_*(\mathcal{F})] = [\alpha_*]$. Thus $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$.

Conversely suppose that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$. If $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal then Proposition 6.7 implies that $[\alpha_*]$ is $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$-detected where $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M)$ takes values in some $\widetilde{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})_k$ and $\rho(\pi_1(T_j))$ contains no parabolics for each j. If $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ contains a compact leaf, M admits a fibration $\mathcal{F}_1$ which strongly detects $[\alpha_*]$. On the other hand, each attached N_t admits a fibration of slope h_0 which can be glued to $\mathcal{F}_1$ to produce a co-oriented taut foliation in W_t. Suppose then that either $v([\alpha_*]) > 0$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is constructed as in Proposition 6.5 or $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal and each leaf of $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ is non-compact. Let k_0 denote the smallest integer congruent to 1 mod t which is positive when $v([\alpha_*]) > 0$ and greater than $k(\mathcal{F})$ otherwise. Using Lemma 6.10 or Lemma 6.12 one can fix a foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ on M which is k_0 interval-hyperbolic on each component of ∂M.

For each $t \geq 2$ there is a presentation $\pi_1(N_t) = \langle a, b : a^t b^t \rangle$ where $\pi_1(\partial N_t) = \langle h_0 = ab, h_1 = a^t \rangle$. By Corollary 2.3 of [JN1] we can find elements $A, B \in \widetilde{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that $A^t = \mathrm{sh}(1), B^t = \mathrm{sh}(-1)$ while AB is hyperbolic of translation number 0. Let $\rho_t : \pi_1(N_t) \to \widetilde{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ be the obvious homomorphism determined by A and B. Then $\rho_t(h_1) = \rho_t(a^t) = A^t = \mathrm{sh}(1)$, so $\rho_t \in \mathcal{R}_0(N_t)$. Further, as $\rho_t(h_0) = AB$ is hyperbolic of translation number 0, the slope on ∂N_t detected by ρ_t is $[h_0]$. The reader will verify that the restriction of the foliation $\mathcal{F}(\rho_t)$ on N_t to ∂N_t has exactly two closed leaves isotopic to h_0 and after thickening the leaves containing these two circles we obtain a 1 interval-hyperbolic foliation on N_t which detects $[h_0]$.

Lemma 2.1 implies that there is a cover $N_t \to N_t$ of order k_0 which preserves the slope $[h_0]$. Hence the pull-back of $\mathcal{F}(\rho_t)$ to this cover is a foliation $\mathcal{F}_{k_0}$ on N_t which is k_0 interval-hyperbolic of slope $[h_0]$ on ∂N_t. Lemma 6.9(2) implies that we can piece together the foliation $\mathcal{F}'$ the foliations $\mathcal{F}_{k_0}$ on each N_t to obtain the desired co-oriented taut foliation on W_t. □

7. Detecting rational slopes via L-spaces

In this section we show to how detect rational elements of $\mathcal{S}(M)$ using Heegaard-Floer homology.

7.1. **Some background results on L-spaces.** Here is an elementary fact that we will use below. Its proof follows from the homology exact sequence of the pair (W, M_1). (Compare with [Wa1, Lemma 3.2].)

Lemma 7.1. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two rational homology solid tori and $W = M_1 \cup_f M_2$ where $f : \partial M_1 \to \partial M_2$ is a homeomorphism. Then*

$$|H_1(W)| = d_1 d_2 |T_1(M_1)||T_1(M_2)|\Delta(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$$

where λ_j is the rational longitude of M_j, $d_j \geq 1$ is its order in $H_1(M_j)$, and $T_1(M_j)$ is the torsion subgroup of $H_1(M_j)$. □

Recall the manifolds N_t from §2.2.3 and the basis $\{h_0, h_1\}$ of $H_1(\partial N_t)$ where h_0 is the rational longitude of N_t. (The classes h_0, h_1 are only well-defined up to sign.) In what follows we take R to be a compact, connected orientable 3-manifold with torus boundary and $f : \partial R \to \partial N_t$ to be a gluing map. Set

$$W_t(f) = R \cup_f N_t$$

We call $W_t(f)$ an *N_t-filling* of R. A striking property of N_2-fillings was proved in [BGW].

Proposition 7.2. ([BGW]) *Let R be a compact, connected, orientable 3-manifold with torus boundary and suppose that f_1 and f_2 are homeomorphisms $\partial R \to \partial N_2$ such that f_2 is obtained by post-composing f_1 by a Dehn twist in ∂N_2 along h_0. Then $\widehat{HF}(W_2(f_1)) \cong \widehat{HF}(W_2(f_2))$.*

Proof. This result follows from [BGW, Proposition 7]. Compare with the proof of Theorem 7 of that paper and the comments which follow it. □

Watson has generalised this result to a wider class of manifolds he calls *Heegaard-Floer solid tori*. In particular, for each integer $t \geq 2$ he has shown that the manifold N_t defined in §2.2.3 is a Heegaard-Floer solid torus.

Proposition 7.3. (Watson [Wa2]) *Let R be a compact, connected, orientable 3-manifold with torus boundary and suppose that f_1 and f_2 are homeomorphisms $\partial N_t \to \partial R$ such that f_2 is obtained by precomposing f_1 by a Dehn twist in ∂N_t along h_0. Then $\widehat{HF}(W_t(f_1)) \cong \widehat{HF}(W_t(f_2))$.*

A closed, connected 3-manifold V is an *L-space* if it is a rational homology sphere with the property that $\text{rank}(\widehat{HF}(V)) = |H_1(V)|$. Examples of L-spaces include lens spaces and, more generally, connected sums of manifolds with elliptic geometry [OSz2, Proposition 2.3]. L-spaces do not admit smooth co-orientable taut foliations ([OSz1, Theorem 1.4]). Here is an immediate consequence of Lemma 7.1 and Proposition 7.2.

Corollary 7.4. *If f_2 is obtained by post-composing f_1 by a Dehn twist in ∂N_t along h_0, then $N_t \cup_{f_1} R$ is an L-space if and only if $N_t \cup_{f_2} R$ is an L-space.* □

If R is a compact, connected 3-manifold with torus boundary and $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ is a basis of $H_1(\partial R)$, then $(\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta)$ is called a *triad* if

$$|H_1(R(\alpha))| + |H_1(R(\beta))| = |H_1(R(\alpha + \beta))|$$

A key property of L-space Dehn filling has been proven by Ozsváth and Szabó.

Proposition 7.5. ([OSz2, Proposition 2.1], [BGW, Proposition 4]) *Suppose that R is a compact, connected, orientable 3-manifold with torus boundary. If $(\alpha, \beta, \alpha+\beta)$ is a triad such that $R(\alpha)$ and $R(\beta)$ are L-spaces, then $R(u\alpha+v\beta)$ is an L-space for all coprime integer pairs $u, v \geq 0$.* □

Here is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 7.6. *Let $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ be a basis of $H_1(\partial R)$ and let $f : \partial R \to \partial N_t$ be a gluing map. Then there exists f' such that $W_t(f) \cong W_t(f')$ and $f'_* = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, with respect to the bases $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ of $H_1(\partial R)$ and $\{h_0, h_1\}$ of $H_1(\partial N_t)$, can be chosen so that $c \geq 0$ and $\det(f'_*) = 1$.* □

The next lemma will be used to study L-space N_t-filling.

Lemma 7.7. *Suppose that R is a compact, connected, orientable 3-manifold with torus boundary. Fix a basis $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ of $H_1(\partial R)$ so that the rational longitude of R is of the form $[\lambda_R] = [p\alpha_1 - q\alpha_2]$ for some $p, q \geq 0$ and set $\mathcal{T}(R) = \overline{\{\frac{r}{s} : R(r\alpha_1 - s\alpha_2) \text{ is not an L-space}\}} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cup \{\frac{1}{0}\}$. Let $f : \partial R \to \partial N_t$ be a homeomorphism with $f_* = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ with respect to the bases $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ of $H_1(\partial R)$ and $\{h_0, h_1\}$ of $H_1(\partial N_t)$ where $c \geq 0$ and $\det(f_*) = 1$. If $\frac{b+td}{a+tc}, \frac{(1-t)b+td}{(1-t)a+tc} \notin \mathcal{T}(R)$ and $-t < \frac{pa-qb}{pc-qd} < \frac{t}{t-1}$, then $W_t(f)$ is an L-space.*

Proof. Denote by C_t the exterior in N_t of the exceptional fibre K_1 of type $\frac{1}{t}$. Then $\partial C_t = \partial N_t \sqcup T_1$ where T_1 is the boundary of a tubular neighbourhood of K_1 in N_t. Denote an oriented fibre slope on T_1 by ϕ_1 and by β_1 the oriented slope of K_1 of distance 1 from ϕ_1 such that $t\beta_1 + \phi_1$ is the meridional slope of K_1. Then $t\beta_1 + \phi_1 = 0$ in $H_1(N_t)$. Without loss of generality we can suppose that h_1 is oriented so that $h_1 = \phi_1$ in $H_1(C_t)$.

The exterior of the two exceptional fibres of N_t can be identified with $P \times S^1$, where P is a twice-punctured disk, in such a way that writing $\partial P = \partial_0 \sqcup \partial_1 \sqcup \partial_2$ then

- $\partial N_t = \partial_0 \times S^1$ and $T_1 = \partial_1 \times S^1$;
- ∂_0, ∂_1 and ∂_2 can be oriented so that $\beta_1 = [\partial_1]$ and $[\partial_1] + [\partial_2] = [\partial_0]$ in $H_1(P)$.
- $t[\partial_2] + (t-1)\phi_2 = 0$ in $H_1(C_t)$ where ϕ_2 represents the fibre slope on the boundary of a tubular neighbourhood of the exceptional fibre K_2 of type $\frac{t-1}{t}$.

Then in $H_1(C_t)$ we have

$$t\beta_1 = t[\partial_0] - t[\partial_2] = t[\partial_0] + (t-1)h_1$$

The rational longitude h_0 of N_t corresponds homologously in C_t to the meridional class $t\beta_1 + \phi_1$ of K_1, at least up to a non-zero rational multiple. Hence from above, h_0 corresponds to $(t[\partial_0] + (t-1)h_1) + h_1 = t([\partial_0] + h_1)$. In other words we can take $[\partial_0] = h_0 - h_1$ and therefore $t\beta_1 = t[\partial_0] + (t-1)h_1 = th_0 - h_1$. It follows that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$xt\beta_1 + y\phi_1 = xth_0 + (y-x)h_1$$

In particular in $H_1(C_t)$ we have $\phi_1 = h_1$ and

$$t\beta_1 = th_0 - h_1$$

Further if $\beta_2 = \beta_1 + \phi_1$ then

$$t\beta_2 = th_0 + (t-1)h_1$$

Let $E = R \cup_f C_t$. Then $\partial E = T_1$ and $E(t\beta_1 + \phi_1) = W(f)$. Since $\Delta(\beta_j, \phi_1) = 1$, $C_t(\beta_j)$ is a solid torus for $j = 1, 2$. Thus $E(\beta_j)$ is a Dehn filling of R. Indeed,

$$E(\beta_1) = R(f_*^{-1}(th_0 - h_1)) = R((b+td)\alpha_1 - (a+tc)\alpha_2)$$

and so as $\frac{b+td}{a+tc} \notin \mathcal{T}(R)$, $E(\beta_1)$ is an L-space. In particular, $|H_1(E(\beta_1))| \neq 0$. Similarly

$$E(\beta_2) = R(((1-t)b + td)\alpha_1 - ((1-t)a + tc)\alpha_2)$$

and so as $\frac{(1-t)b+td}{(1-t)a+tc} \notin \mathcal{T}(R)$, $E(\beta_2)$ is an L-space. Therefore $|H_1(E(\beta_2))| \neq 0$.

For any slope γ' on ∂R we have $|H_1(R(\gamma');\mathbb{Z})| = k\Delta(\gamma', \lambda_R) = k\Delta(\gamma', p\alpha_1 - q\alpha_2)$, where k is a constant determined by R as in Lemma 7.1. Hence

$$|H_1(E(\beta_1))| = |H_1(R((b+td)\alpha_1 - (a+tc)\alpha_2))| = k|t(pc-qd) - (qb-pa)| = k|tx+y|$$

where $x = pc - qd$ and $y = pa - qb$, while

$$|H_1(E(\beta_2))| = |H_1(R(((1-t)b+td)\alpha_1 - ((1-t)a+tc)\alpha_2))| = k|tx + (1-t)y|$$

Since $|H_1(E(\beta_1))|, |H_1(E(\beta_2))| \neq 0$ it follows that $|H_1(E(\beta_1+\beta_2))| = |H_1(E(\beta_1))| + |H_1(E(\beta_2))|$ if and only if $\text{sign}(\beta_1 \cdot \lambda_R) = \text{sign}(\beta_2 \cdot \lambda_R)$. Equivalently, $\text{sign}(tx+y) = \text{sign}(tx+(1-t)y)$. Since $\frac{pa-qb}{pc-qd} = \frac{a}{c} + \frac{q}{cx}$, the reader will verify that this occurs if and only if $-t < \frac{y}{x} = \frac{pa-qb}{pc-qd} < \frac{t}{t-1}$, which we have assumed. Proposition 7.5 now implies that $W_t(f) = E(t\beta_1 + \phi_1)$ is an L-space. □

7.2. L-space N_t-fillings of M when its base orbifold is non-orientable.

Proposition 7.8. *Let M be a Seifert manifold with base orbifold $Q(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ as in §2.2 and let $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r])$ be a rational element of $\mathcal{S}(M)$. Let W_t be a graph manifold obtained by gluing N_t to M along each T_j in such a way that $[h_0]$ is identified with $[\alpha_j]$. Then for all $t \geq 2$, W_t is an L-space if and only if $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal.*

Proof. Fix $t \geq 2$. If some $[\alpha_j]$ is vertical, then W_t is not a rational homology 3-sphere since the fibre class on ∂M is rationally null-homologous in M. In particular, W_t is not an L-space. Suppose then that $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal. We show that W_t is an L-space by induction on r. Without loss of generality we suppose that each α_j is a primitive element of $H_1(T_j)$.

Base case. Suppose that $r = 1$, so Q is a Möbius band, and let $T = \partial M$. As usual, $h \in H_1(T)$ represents the slope of the Seifert fibre on ∂M in the given structure and $h^* \in H_1(T)$ is the dual class defined in §2.2. We apply Lemma 7.7 as follows.

As Q is non-orientable, h represents the rational longitude of M. In particular, relative to the basis $\{h, h^*\}$ the coordinates p, q of the rational longitude are $p = 1, q = 0$. If γ represents a non-longitudinal slope on ∂M, then $\Delta(\gamma, h) \geq 1$ and $M(\gamma)$ is a Seifert fibred rational homology 3-sphere with base orbifold $P^2(a_1, \ldots, a_n, \Delta(\gamma, h))$, so it is an L-space [BGW, Proposition 5]. Thus $\mathcal{T}(M) = \overline{\{\frac{r}{s} : M(rh - sh^*) \text{ is not an L-space}\}} = \{\frac{1}{0}\}$.

Let $f : \partial M \to \partial N_t$ be a gluing map such that $f^{-1}(h_0)$ is horizontal. In other words, $f^{-1}(h_0) \neq \pm h$. By Lemma 7.6 we can suppose that its matrix $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ with respect to the bases $\{h, h^*\}$ and $\{h_0, h_1\}$ satisfies $c \geq 0$ and $\det(f_*) = 1$. Since $f^{-1}(h_0) \neq \pm h$, $c > 0$. Corollary 7.4 implies that the question of whether $W_t = W_t(f)$ is an L-space depends only on (c, d). Thus after adding an appropriate multiple of the second row of f to the first row we may assume that $-c < a \leq 0$. Then $-t < -1 < \frac{a}{c} = \frac{pa-qb}{pc-qd} \leq 0 < \frac{t}{t-1}$. Thus $a + tc \neq 0$ and $(1-t)a + tc \neq 0$, so $\frac{b+td}{a+tc}, \frac{(1-t)b+td}{(1-t)a+tc} \notin \mathcal{T}(M)$. By Lemma 7.7 $W_t(f)$ is an L-space.

Inductive case. Suppose that the result holds when $1 \leq |\partial M| < r$. Let R be a manifold obtained by gluing $r-1$ copies of N_t to M along ∂M in such a way that for each $1 \leq j \leq r-1$, $[h_0]$ is identified with $[\alpha_j]$. Then $\partial R = T_r$. Let $h \in H_1(\partial R)$ represent the slope of the Seifert fibre of M and let h^* be a dual class to h. As Q is non-orientable, h represents the rational longitude of R. Our inductive hypothesis implies that any Dehn filling of R along a slope other than $[h]$ is an L-space, so again we will apply Lemma 7.7 where $\mathcal{T}(R) = \overline{\{\frac{r}{s} : R(rh - sh^*) \text{ is not an L-space}\}} = \{\frac{1}{0}\}$, $p = 1, q = 0$. That is, if $f : \partial R \to \partial N_t$ is a gluing map such that $f^{-1}(h_0) \neq \pm h$, write $f_* = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ with respect to the bases $\{h, h^*\}$ and $\{h_0, h_1\}$ and proceed as in the base case to complete the induction. □

7.3. L-space N_t-fillings of M when its base orbifold is orientable.

In this section we suppose that M is a Seifert manifold with base orbifold $P(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ as in §2.2. Fix a rational element $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r])$ of $\mathcal{S}(M)$ and let W_t be a graph manifold obtained by gluing N_t to M along each T_j in such a way that $[h_0]$ is identified with $[\alpha_j]$. Recall that $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$ is the set of all $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ which are foliation detected.

Proposition 7.9. *If $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$ then W_t is not an L-space.*

Proof. This result is a consequence of the main result of [BC], so we only sketch the argument here. (Rachel Roberts has informed the authors that she and Will Kazez have shown that no rational homology 3-sphere admitting a topological co-oriented taut foliation can be an L-space.)

Proposition 6.5 implies that if $v([\alpha_*]) > 0$ then $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 2$. In this case W_t is not a rational homology 3-sphere since it contains a closed non-separating orientable surface obtained by piecing together vertical annuli in M with fibre surfaces in the N_t. In particular, W_t is not an L-space. Assume then that $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal. By Proposition 6.7, $[\alpha_*]$ is $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$-detected where ρ takes values in $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ for some $k \geq 1$. Further, we can suppose that for each j, $\rho(\pi_1(T_j))$ contains no parabolics. Reindex the components of ∂M so that $\rho(\pi_1(T_j))$ contains hyperbolics if $1 \leq j \leq s$ and consists of elliptics otherwise. Let $V_0 \subseteq W_t$ be the union of M with the $r-s$ copies of N_t corresponding to $T_{s+1}, \ldots, T_r$. Since N_t fibres over the circle with fibre a surface whose boundary has slope $[h_0]$ (Lemma 2.1), $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ extends smoothly across V_0 to a smooth foliation $\mathcal{F}_0$ which is hyperbolic on each component of ∂V. By the proof of Proposition 6.13, the copies $V_1, \ldots, V_s$ of N_t corresponding to one of the tori T_j $(1 \leq j \leq s)$ each admits a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}_j = \mathcal{F}(\rho)$ where $\rho : \pi_1(W_t) \to \widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ is hyperbolic on T_j and sends the h to $\mathrm{sh}(1)$.

We can approximate each foliation $\mathcal{F}_j$ by boundary-transverse positive, resp. negative, contact structures $\xi_j^{\pm}$ ([ET]) whose characteristic foliations on ∂V_j are hyperbolic. Further, there are closed 2-forms $\omega_0, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_s$ on W_t such that $\omega_j|\xi_j^{\pm} > 0$ and ω_j vanishes outside an arbitrarily small neighbourhood of V_j (cf. pages 157–158 of [Ca2]).

Now let T and T' be two boundary tori which are identified in forming W_t from $V_0, V_1, \ldots, V_s$. We can replace T by a product $T \times [0,1]$ with contact structures $\xi_T^{\pm}$ which interpolate between the contact structures on the V_j bordering T. We can also construct a closed 2-form ω_T on W_t which is positive on $\xi_T^{\pm}|T \times (0,1)$ and vanishes on its complement. Once this is done we can piece together the contact structures $\xi_j^{\pm}$ and $\xi_T^{\pm}$ and form a positive linear combination of the closed 2-forms ω_j and ω_T to produce a closed 2-form ω and contact structures ξ^+, ξ^- of opposite sign on W_t such that $\omega|\xi^{\pm} > 0$.

Fix a smooth 1-form α on W_t which evaluates positively on a vector field tranverse to both ξ^+ and ξ^- and let p and q be the projections of $X = W_t \times [-1,1]$ to W_t and $[-1,1]$. For $\epsilon > 0$ consider the closed 2-form

$$\omega_X = p^*(\omega) + \epsilon d(q^*(\alpha))$$

on X. For ϵ small, $\omega_X \wedge \omega_X > 0$ and so ω_X is a symplectic form which is positive on $\xi^+ \times \{1\}$ and $\xi^- \times \{-1\}$. Thus (W_t, ξ^+) is semi-fillable and therefore W_t is not an L-space [OSz1, Theorem 1.4]. □

Set

$$\mathcal{L}_{fol}(M) = \mathcal{S}(M) \setminus \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$$

Proposition 7.10. *Let M be a Seifert manifold with base orbifold $P(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ as in §2.2 and fix a rational element $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r])$ of $\mathcal{S}(M)$. Let W_t be a graph manifold obtained by gluing N_t to M along each T_j in such a way that $[h_0]$ is identified with $[\alpha_j]$. Then there exists $t \geq 2$ such that W_t is an L-space if and only if either $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ or $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{L}_{fol}(M)$. If $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$, then W_2 is an L-space.*

Proof. If $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 2$, then W_t is not a rational homology 3-sphere since it contains a closed non-separating orientable surface obtained by piecing together vertical annuli in M with fibre surfaces in N_t. In particular, W_t is not an L-space. If $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$, then W_t is not an L-space by Proposition 7.9. This shows that if W_t is an L-space for some $t \geq 2$ then either $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ or $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{L}_{fol}(M)$.

Conversely if $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ we can appeal to Proposition 7.8 to see that W_2 is an L-space since the slope $[h_0]$ on N_2 is the fibre slope of a Seifert structure on N_2 with base orbifold the Möbius band. To complete

the proof we assume that $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{L}_{fol}(M)$ and then show that there exists $t \geq 2$ such that W_t is an L-space. We proceed by induction on r.

Base case. Suppose that $r = 1$, so $P \cong D^2$. Let $h \in H_1(\partial M)$ represent the slope of the Seifert fibre on ∂M and recall that we have fixed a presentation $\pi_1(M) = \langle y_1, \dots, y_n, h : h \text{ central}, y_1^{a_1} = h^{b_1}, \dots, y_n^{a_n} = h^{b_n} \rangle$. The class $y_1 y_2 \dots y_n$ is peripheral and represents a dual class $h^* \in H_1(\partial M)$ to h. A simple calculation shows that if $q = a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$ and $p = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{q b_i}{a_i}$, then

$$[\lambda_M] = [ph - qh^*]$$

Note that $M(h)$ is a connected sum of lens spaces and hence an L-space.

Corollary A.7 implies that $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$ is a closed interval in $\mathcal{S}(M) \cong S^1$ containing $[\lambda_M]$. Thus $\mathcal{L}_{fol}(M)$ is an open interval containing $[h]$. Recall $\mathcal{T}(M) = \overline{\{\frac{r}{s} : M(rh - sh^*) \text{ is not an L-space}\}} \subset \mathbb{R} \cup \{\frac{1}{0}\}$. Then $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M) = \{[\gamma h - h^*] : \gamma \in \mathcal{T}(M)\}$. Then there are rational numbers $\eta \leq \zeta$ such that

$$\frac{p}{q} \in \mathcal{T}(M) = [\eta, \zeta]$$

See Proposition A.4.

Let $f : \partial M \to \partial N_t$ be the gluing map and set $W_t = W_t(f) = M \cup_f N_t$. Write $f_* = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ with respect to the bases $\{h, h^*\}$ and $\{h_0, h_1\}$. We can always assume $f_* = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ where $c \geq 0$ and $\det(f_*) = 1$ by Lemma 2.2. Note that

$$[\alpha_*] = [f^{-1}(h_0)] = [dh - ch^*]$$

and thus $c \neq 0$ since we have assumed $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$. If $a = 0$, then $W_2(f)$ is Seifert with base orbifold of the form $S^2(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, 2, 2)$ and is therefore *not* an L-space if and only if it admits a horizontal foliation ([LS]). But if $W_2(f)$ admits a horizontal foliation, then $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$ by Proposition 6.13, contrary to our assumptions. Hence the proposition holds when $a = 0$ (so $c = 1$). Therefore by Proposition 7.2, $W_2(f)$ is an L-space whenever $c = 1$.

Suppose now that $c \geq 2$. As $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{L}_{fol}(M)$, $\frac{d}{c} \notin [\eta, \zeta]$. First suppose that $\frac{d}{c} < \eta$.

Claim 7.11. *Suppose that $\frac{d}{c} + \frac{1}{c(tc+1)} < \eta$. Then $W_t(f)$ is an L-space. In particular this is true if $t \gg 0$.*

Proof. We show that the hypotheses of Proposition 7.7 are satisfied under the conditions of this claim. The reader will verify that $\frac{pa-qb}{pc-qd} = \frac{a}{c} + \frac{q}{c(pc-qd)}$ and therefore that the condition "$-t < \frac{pa-qb}{pc-qd} < \frac{t}{t-1}$" of Proposition 7.7 is equivalent to "$-c(tc+a) < \frac{1}{\frac{p}{q} - \frac{d}{c}} < c\big((\frac{t}{t-1})c - a\big)$". Choosing a so that $-tc < a < -(t-1)c$ (cf. Corollary 7.4), this is equivalent to $\frac{d}{c} + \frac{1}{c\big((\frac{t}{t-1})c-a\big)} < \frac{p}{q}$. With this value of a we have $\frac{d}{c} + \frac{1}{c\big((\frac{t}{t-1})c-a\big)} < \frac{d}{c} + \frac{1}{c(tc+1)} < \eta \leq \frac{p}{q}$ and therefore $-t < \frac{pa-qb}{pc-qd} < \frac{t}{t-1}$.

Next observe that $\frac{b+td}{a+tc} = \frac{d}{c} - \frac{1}{c(ct+a)} < \frac{d}{c} < \eta$ while $\frac{(1-t)b+td}{(1-t)a+tc} = \frac{d}{c} + \frac{1}{c\big((\frac{t}{t-1})c-a\big)} < \frac{d}{c} + \frac{1}{c(tc+1)} < \eta$. Hence $\frac{b+td}{a+tc}, \frac{(1-t)b+td}{(1-t)a+tc} \notin \mathcal{T}(R)$ so that $W_t(f)$ is an L-space by Proposition 7.7. □

The case that $\frac{d}{c} > \zeta$ is handled similarly and is left to the reader. This completes the proof of the base case of the induction.

Inductive case. Suppose that the result holds when $1 \leq |\partial M| < r$ and let R be a manifold obtained by gluing $r - 1$ copies of N_t to M along ∂M in such a way that for each $1 \leq j \leq r - 1$, $[h_0]$ is identified with $[\alpha_j]$. Then $\partial R = T_r$. Let $h \in H_1(\partial R)$ represent the slope of the Seifert fibre of M and let $h^* \in H_1(\partial R)$ be a dual class to h oriented so that there are coprime integers p, q such that the rational longitude of R can be written $\lambda_R = ph - qh^*$. Let $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(R) = \{[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T_r) : [\alpha] \text{ is detected by a co-oriented, taut foliation in } R\}$. If $[\alpha_r] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(R)$, then it follows from the proof of Proposition 6.13 that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$, contrary to our hypotheses. Thus $[\alpha_r] \in \mathcal{S}(R) \setminus \mathcal{D}_{fol}(R)$.

Let $f : \partial R \to \partial N_t$ be a gluing map and write $f_* = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ with respect to the bases $\{h, h^*\}$ and $\{h_0, h_1\}$. As above we can suppose that $c \geq 0$ and we have $[\alpha_r] = [f^{-1}(h_0)] = [dh - ch^*]$.

Since we have assumed $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$, $c \neq 0$. If $a = 0$, in which case $c = 1$, then $M' = M \cup_f N_2$ is Seifert with base orbifold $P'(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n, 2, 2)$ where P' is an $(r-1)$-punctured 2-sphere. Note that $([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_{r-1}]) \notin \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M')$ as otherwise $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$ by the proof of Proposition 6.13. Thus $([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_{r-1}]) \in \mathcal{L}_{fol}(M')$ so our inductive hypothesis implies that $W_t(f)$ is an L-space for some $t \geq 2$. Proposition 7.2 then implies that $W_t(f)$ is an L-space whenever $c = 1$.

Suppose that $c \geq 2$ and fix $f : \partial R \to \partial N_t$ such that $f_* = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Let $\tau_j \in \mathbb{Q}$ be chosen so that $[\alpha_j] = [\tau_j h - h^*]$ $(1 \leq j \leq r-1)$. Then we identify $\mathcal{T}(R) = \overline{\{\frac{r}{s} : R(rh - sh^*) \text{ is not an L-space}\}}$ with $\mathcal{T}(M; \emptyset; \tau_*)$ using Proposition A.4. Thus $\mathcal{T}(R)$ is an interval $[\eta, \zeta]$ with rational end-points. Further note that $\mathcal{T}(R)$ contains $\frac{p}{q}$. With this setup we can proceed exactly as in the proof of the base case to see that $W_t(f)$ is an L-space for for some $t \geq 2$, which completes the induction. □

7.4. **L-space N_t-fillings of M.**

Definition 7.12. Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2. For $J \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ and rational $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$, let $\mathcal{M}_t(J; [\alpha_*])$ denote the set of manifolds obtained by doing $[\alpha_j]$-Dehn filling of M for $j \in J$, and for each $j \notin J$ attaching N_t to M in such a way that the rational longitude $[h_0]$ of N_t is identified with $[\alpha_j]$.

Remark 7.13. Let M' be obtained by Dehn filling M along all horizontal rational slopes $[\alpha_j]$ with $j \in J$. Then M' inherits a Seifert structure from M and $\mathcal{M}_t(J; [\alpha_*]) = \mathcal{M}'_t(J'; [\alpha'_*])$ where $[\alpha'_*]$ is the projection of $[\alpha_*]$ to $\mathcal{S}(M')$ and $J' = \{j \in J : [\alpha_j] = [h]\}$. Note that M' is closed if and only if $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal and $J = \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$.

Here are two corollaries of the propositions above.

Corollary 7.14. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2. Fix $J \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ and rational $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$. If $v([\alpha_*]) > 0$, then*

(1) *No element of $\mathcal{M}_t(J; [\alpha_*])$ is an L-space if either $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 2$ or $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ and M has base orbifold $Q(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$.*

(2) *Each element of $\mathcal{M}_2(J; [\alpha_*])$ is an L-space if $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ and M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$.*

Proof. If $v([\alpha_*]) \geq 2$ or if $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ and M has base orbifold $Q(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, then each element of $\mathcal{M}_t(J; [\alpha_*])$ admits a co-orientable taut foliation no matter what J is, and so is not an L-space. Suppose that $v([\alpha_*]) = 1$ and M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. Let M' and J' be as in Remark 7.13. Note that M' is not closed since $[\alpha_*]$ is not horizontal. If $J' = \emptyset$, each element of $\mathcal{M}_2(J; [\alpha_*]) = \mathcal{M}'_2(J'; [\alpha'_*])$ is an L-space by Proposition 7.8 applied to M'. Otherwise, each element of $\mathcal{M}_2(J; [\alpha_*]) = \mathcal{M}'_2(J'; [\alpha'_*])$ is a connected sum of lens spaces, and so is an L-space. □

Corollary 7.15. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2 and fix $J \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ and rational $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(M)$. There exists $t \geq 2$ such that some manifold in $\mathcal{M}_t(J; [\alpha_*])$ is an L-space if and only if each manifold in $\mathcal{M}_t(J; [\alpha_*])$ is an L-space.*

Proof. The previous corollary shows that the result holds with $t = 2$ when $v([\alpha_*]) > 0$. Assume then that $v([\alpha_*]) = 0$ and let M' and J' be as in Remark 7.13. Clearly $J' = \emptyset$. If M' is closed, $\mathcal{M}_t(J; [\alpha_*]) = \{M'\}$, so the result is obvious. Otherwise it is a direct consequence of Propositions 7.8 and 7.10 applied to M'. □

7.5. **Detecting slopes via L-spaces.**

Definition 7.16. Let $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r])$ be a rational element of $\mathcal{S}(M)$. For $J \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$, we say that $(J; [\alpha_*])$ is *NLS detected* if there exists $t \geq 2$ such that no manifold in $\mathcal{M}_t(J; [\alpha_*])$ is an L-space.

We shall often simplify the phrase "$(\emptyset;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS detected" to "$[\alpha_*]$ is NLS detected". Similarly, we simplify "$(\{1,2,\dots,r\};[\alpha_*])$ is NLS detected," to "$[\alpha_*]$ is *strongly* NLS detected".

Remark 7.17. We expect that $[\alpha_*]$ is NLS detected if and only if no manifold in $\mathcal{M}_2(J;[\alpha_*])$ is an L-space, so that $t=2$ suffices for our definition of NLS detection.

Set

$$\mathcal{D}_{NLS}(M;J)=\{[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M):(J;[\alpha_*]) \text{ is NLS detected}\}$$

When $J=\emptyset$ we simplify $\mathcal{D}_{NLS}(M;J)$ to $\mathcal{D}_{NLS}(M)$.

7.6. **NLS-detection versus foliation detection.** Set

$$\mathcal{D}^0_{NLS}(M;J)=\mathcal{D}_{NLS}(M;J)\cap\{[\alpha_*]:[\alpha_j]\neq[h] \text{ for } j\in J\}$$

Proposition 7.18. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2 and fix $J\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,r\}$. Then $\mathcal{D}^0_{NLS}(M;J)=\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M;J)$.*

Proof. If M has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, then

$$\mathcal{D}^0_{NLS}(M;J)=\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M;J)=\{[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M):v([\alpha_*])\geq 1 \text{ and } [\alpha_j]\neq[h] \text{ for } j\in J\}$$

by Proposition 6.5 and Corollary 7.14.

Next suppose that M has base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$. It is clear that $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M;J)\subseteq\mathcal{D}^0_{NLS}(M;J)$. Assume, on the other hand, that $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{D}^0_{NLS}(M;J)$. In this case, there exists $t\geq 2$ such that $\mathcal{M}_t(J;[\alpha_*])=\mathcal{M}'_t(\emptyset;[\alpha'_*])$ consists of non-L-spaces. If M' is closed, then $J=\{1,2,\dots,r\}$ and $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal. The main result of [LS] implies that M' admits a horizontal foliation and therefore $[\alpha_*]$ is strongly detected. In particular, $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M;J)$.

Finally suppose that M' is not closed. Proposition 7.10 then implies that $[\alpha'_*]\in\mathcal{D}^0_{NLS}(M')$ if and only if $v([\alpha'_*])\geq 2$ or $v([\alpha'_*])=0$ and $[\alpha'_*]\in\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M')$. In the former case $v([\alpha_*])\geq 2$ and therefore $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M;J)$ by Proposition 6.5. In the latter case, $[\alpha'_*]$ is $\mathcal{F}'$-detected for some horizontal foliation of M' (Lemma 6.2). It follows that after an isotopy we may arrange for $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{F}'\cap M$ to detect $(J;[\alpha_*])$. Thus $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M;J)$, which completes the proof. □

8. The slope detection theorem

In this section we state and prove the slope detection theorem.

Theorem 8.1. *Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2 and fix $J\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,r\}$. Suppose that $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M)$ is an r-tuple of slopes such that $[\alpha_j]\neq[h]$ for $j\in J$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is order detected.*

(2) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected.*

(3) *If $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal, $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is representation detected.*

(4) *If $[\alpha_*]$ is rational, $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS-detected.*

Theorem 1.6 is the case $J=\emptyset$ of Theorem 8.1. (Note that this theorem is easy to verify when M is a solid torus or the product of a torus with an interval. Theorem 8.1 handles the remaining cases.)

The proof of Theorem 8.1 naturally splits into two cases.

8.1. **The case that $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal.** We must show that the following statements are equivalent:

- $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is order detected.
- $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is representation detected.
- $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected.
- If $[\alpha_*]$ is rational, $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS-detected.

The proof is a consequence of the following two propositions.

Proposition 8.2. *Suppose that M has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal. Then*

(1) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is not order detected.*

(2) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is not representation detected.*

(3) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is not foliation detected.*

(4) *If $[\alpha_*]$ is rational, $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is not NLS-detected.*

Proof. The underlying space of Q is non-orientable and therefore M admits no co-oriented, horizontal foliation. Thus $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is not foliation detected. It is neither order detected nor representation detected by Proposition 4.7 and Lemma 3.2.

Finally suppose that $[\alpha_*]$ is rational and let M' be the manifold obtained by performing $[\alpha_j]$-Dehn filling of M for $j\in J$. Then M' is a Seifert fibred manifold whose base orbifold has underlying space a (possibly) punctured projective plane. If M' is closed, it is an L-space ([BGW, Proposition 5]) and so as $J=\{1,2,\dots,r\}$ in this case, $[\alpha_*]$ is not NLS detected. Suppose then that M' is not closed and let $[\alpha'_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M')$ be the projection of $[\alpha_*]$. By construction, $[\alpha'_*]$ is horizontal with respect to the induced Seifert structure on M' and therefore $[\alpha'_*]$ is not NLS detected by Proposition 7.8. But then $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is not NLS detected, which completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 8.3. *Suppose that M has base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is order detected.*

(2) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is representation detected.*

(3) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected.*

(4) *If $[\alpha_*]$ is rational, $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS-detected.*

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is contained in Propositions 4.5 and 5.4 while that of (2) and (3) is contained in Proposition 6.3. Finally we show that (3) is equivalent to (4) when $[\alpha_*]$ is rational.

Suppose that $[\alpha_*]$ is rational and let M' be the manifold obtained by performing $[\alpha_j]$-Dehn filling of M for $j\in J$. Then M' is a Seifert fibred manifold whose base orbifold has underlying space a (possibly) punctured 2-sphere. If M' is closed then $J=\{1,2,\dots,r\}$ and M' is Seifert fibred with base orbifold a 2-sphere with cone points. In this case it was shown in [LS] that M' is not an L-space if and only if it admits a horizontal foliation. As the latter is equivalent to the foliation detectability of $(\{1,2,\dots,r\};[\alpha_*])$, (3) and (4) are equivalent when $J=\{1,2,\dots,r\}$.

Suppose then that $\partial M'\neq\emptyset$ and define $[\alpha'_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M')$ to be the projection of $[\alpha_*]$. By construction, $[\alpha'_*]$ is horizontal with respect to the induced Seifert structure on M'. It is clear that $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected if and only if $[\alpha'_*]$ is foliation detected and that $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS detected if and only if $[\alpha'_*]$ is NLS detected. On the other hand, Proposition 7.10 shows that $[\alpha'_*]$ is foliation detected if and only if it is NLS detected. Thus (3) is equivalent to (4) when $[\alpha_*]$ is rational and horizontal. □

8.2. **The case that $[\alpha_*]$ is not horizontal.** Assume that $v([\alpha_*])>0$ and $[\alpha_j]\neq[h]$ for $j\in J$. We must show that the following statements are equivalent:

- $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is order detected.
- $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected.
- If $[\alpha_*]$ is rational, $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS detected.

The proof is contained is the following two propositions.

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose that M has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, $v([\alpha_*])\geq 1$, and $[\alpha_j]\neq[h]$ for $j\in J$. Then*

(1) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is order detected.*

(2) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected.*

(3) *If $[\alpha_*]$ is rational, $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS-detected.*

Proof. Statements (1) and (2) follow from Propositions 4.11 and 6.5.

Suppose that $[\alpha_*]$ is rational and let M' be the manifold obtained by performing $[\alpha_j]$-Dehn filling of M for $j\in J$. Then M' is a Seifert fibred manifold whose base orbifold has underlying space a punctured projective plane. Let $[\alpha'_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M')$ be the projection of $[\alpha_*]$. Then $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS detected if and only if $[\alpha'_*]$ is NLS-detected and by construction, $v([\alpha_*])=v([\alpha'_*])\geq 1$. Statement (3) now follows from Proposition 7.8 applied to M' and $[\alpha'_*]$. □

Proposition 8.5. *Suppose that M has base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, that $[\alpha_j]\neq[h]$ for $j\in J$, and that $v([\alpha_*])\geq 1$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) *$v([\alpha_*])\geq 2$.*

(2) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is order detected.*

(3) *$(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation detected.*

(4) *If $[\alpha_*]$ is rational, $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS-detected.*

Proof. Propositions 4.11 and 6.5 imply assertions (1), (2) and (3) are equivalent.

Suppose that $[\alpha_*]$ is rational and let M' be the manifold obtained by performing $[\alpha_j]$-Dehn filling of M for $j\in J$. Since $v([\alpha_*])>0$ and $[\alpha_j]$ is horizontal for all $j\in J$, M' is a Seifert fibred manifold with non-empty boundary whose base orbifold has underlying space a punctured 2-sphere. Let $[\alpha'_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M')$ be the projection of $[\alpha_*]$. Then $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is NLS detected if and only if $[\alpha'_*]$ is NLS-detected and by construction, $v([\alpha'_*])=v([\alpha_*])\geq 1$. The equivalence of (1) and (4) now follows from Proposition 7.10 applied to M' and $[\alpha'_*]$. □

9. The gluing theorem

For M a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2, $J\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,r\}$, and $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(M)$ such that $[\alpha_j]\neq[h]$ for $j\in J$ we say that $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is *detected* if it is foliation detected. By Theorem 8.1 this is the same as being order detected. (And also to representation detected or NLS detected when both notions are defined.)

Fix a graph manifold W as in §2.3 with JSJ pieces $M_1,M_2,\dots,M_n$ and JSJ tori $T_1,T_2,\dots,T_m$. Recall that for $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ and $i\in\{1,2,\dots,n\}$ we defined

$$[\alpha_*^{(i)}]=\Pi_i([\alpha_*])$$

See §2.3. For $K\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,m\}$ and $i\in\{1,2,\dots,n\}$ set

$$K_i=\{k\in K : T_k\subset\partial M_i\}$$

and define $[\alpha_*^{K_i}]$ to be the $|K_i|$-tuple of slopes $[\alpha_j]$ where $j\in K_i$.

Before stating the gluing theorem, we introduce several notions.

Definition 9.1. Fix $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$. We call $(K; [\alpha_*])$ *gluing coherent* if $(K_i; [\alpha_*^{(i)}])$ is detected for all i.

It follows from Lemma 6.4 that if $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent and $k \in K$, then $[\alpha_k]$ is horizontal in each piece of W containing T_k, at least up to assuming that the Seifert structures on pieces homeomorphic to twisted I-bundles over the Klein bottle have orientable base orbifolds.

Given $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ let $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat})$ be the Seifert manifold obtained by $[\alpha_j]$-Dehn filling M_i along its boundary components T_j such that $j \in K_i$ and $[\alpha_j]$ is rational. Set

$$K([\alpha_*]) = K \cup \{j : T_j = \partial M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat}) \text{ for some } i \text{ such that } M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat}) \cong S^1 \times D^2\}$$

Definition 9.2. Given $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ we say that $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is *gluing unobstructed* if $(K([\alpha_*]); [\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent. Otherwise we say that $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is *gluing obstructed*.

Note that when $K = \emptyset$ or $K = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed as long as it is gluing coherent. See Example 12.3 for an example of a W and $(K; [\alpha_*])$ which is gluing coherent but gluing obstructed.

Definition 9.3. (1) We say that a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on W has *K-type* if $\mathcal{F}$ is transverse to T_j for each j, it restricts to a co-oriented taut foliation on each M_i, and $\mathcal{F} \cap T_k$ is linear for $k \in K$.

(2) We say that a left-order $\mathfrak{o}$ on $\pi_1(W)$ has *K-type* if there is an $\mathfrak{o}$-convex normal subgroup C of $\pi_1(W)$ such that $C \cap \pi_1(T_k) \cong \langle \alpha_k \rangle \cap \pi_1(T_k)$ for all $k \in K$.

Convention 9.4. For the rest of the paper we take the convention that the parenthetical phrases in the statements of results are to be either simultaneously considered or simultaneously ignored.

Here is the gluing theorem.

Theorem 9.5. *Let W be a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere with pieces $M_1, \dots, M_n$ and JSJ tori $T_1, \dots, T_m$. Fix $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.*

(1) $\pi_1(W)$ admits a K-type left-order (for which each class represented by a Seifert fibre of a piece of W is cofinal) if and only if K is gluing unobstructed and there is a (horizontal) element $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ such that $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent.

(2) W admits a (horizontal) K-type co-oriented taut foliation if and only if there is a (horizontal) $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ such that $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed.

We prove these results in the next two sections. For now we use them to deduce Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.5. Theorem 1.7 is the case $K = \emptyset$ of Theorem 9.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We remarked in the introduction that statements (2) and (3) of Theorem 1.2 are known to be equivalent (cf. [Li], [BRW, Theorem 1.1(1)]). The equivalence of statements (1) and (2) are immediate consequences of the case $J = \emptyset$ of Theorem 8.1 and the case $K = \emptyset$ of Theorem 9.5. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Statements (2) and (3) of Theorem 1.3 are equivalent by Remark 5.5. Suppose that statement (1) holds and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a co-oriented horizontal foliation on W. Brittenham has shown that $\mathcal{F}$ is $\mathbb{R}$-covered. Indeed, he shows that given a Seifert fibre L of a piece of W, each leaf of the pull-back $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ to the universal cover of W intersects the inverse image $\widetilde{L}$ of L in exactly one point. (See [Br2, §3].) Hence the leaf space $\mathcal{L}$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ can be identified with $\widetilde{L}$. Since L is a transverse loop to $\mathcal{F}$, it carries an element of infinite order in $\pi_1(W)$. Thus $\mathcal{L}$ is a line. Now $\pi_1(W)$ acts on $\mathcal{L}$ via deck transformations and from Brittenham's work we see that the class carried by L acts without fixed points. As L was arbitrary, this action determines a homomorphism $\rho : \pi_1(W) \to \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathcal{L}) \cong \mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ for which the image of the class carried by L is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(\pm 1)$. Thus statement (3) holds.

Conversely suppose that statement (3) holds and let $\rho_i = \rho|\pi_1(M_i)$. There is an associated co-oriented horizontal foliation $\mathcal{F}(\rho_i)$ on M_i (cf. the proof of Proposition 6.3) which detects some $[\alpha_*(\rho_i)] \in \mathcal{S}(M_i)$. The $[\alpha_*(\rho_i)]$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ piece together to yield a horizontal $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ for which $(\emptyset, [\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent (and therefore gluing unobstructed as $K = \emptyset$). Theorem 9.5 then implies that W admits a co-oriented horizontal foliation, which completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Statements (2) and (3) of Theorem 1.5 are equivalent by Remark 5.5. Next observe that W admits a strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation if and only if it admits a K-type co-oriented taut foliation where $K = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. (In both cases the foliations are horizontal by Lemmas 6.2, at least up to assuming that the Seifert structures on pieces homeomorphic to twisted I-bundles over the Klein bottle have orientable base orbifolds.) Hence statements (1) and (2) of Theorem 1.5 are equivalent by Theorems 8.1 and 9.5. □

10. Proof of the gluing theorem: the foliation case

Recall that W is a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere as in §2.3 with JSJ pieces $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_n$ and JSJ tori $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_m\}$. We work with a fixed $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ throughout this section. We must show that W admits a (horizontal) K-type co-oriented taut foliation if and only if there is a (horizontal) element $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ such that $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed.

The forward implication is straightforward: If W admits a (horizontal) K-type co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}$, it induces a (horizontal) element $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ such that $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent. We claim that $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is also gluing unobstructed. To see, this observe that for each piece M_i of W, $\mathcal{F}$ induces a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}_i$ on $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat})$. As the only taut co-orientable foliations on a solid torus are 2-disk fibrations, if $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat}) \cong S^1 \times D^2$, then $\mathcal{F}$ restricts to a foliation on $T_j = \partial M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat})$ which strongly detects $[\alpha_j]$. It follows that $(K([\alpha_*]);[\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent and therefore $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed.

Now we focus on the reverse implication. We suppose below that there is a (horizontal) element $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ such that $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed. Lemma 6.4 implies the following fact.

Lemma 10.1. *If $j \in K([\alpha_*])$ and $[\alpha_j]$ is vertical in a JSJ piece M_i of W incident to T_j, then $M_i \cong N_2$.* □

For $A \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, let $A^\dagger = A \cup \{j : [\alpha_j] \text{ is irrational}\}$. By Proposition 6.6, $(K^\dagger;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent. Since $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i^\dagger}]_{rat}) = M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat})$ for each i, we have

$$K^\dagger([\alpha_*]) = K([\alpha_*])^\dagger,$$

and it follows that $(K,[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed if and only if $(K^\dagger;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed. Hence, without loss of generality, we assume that

$$K = K^\dagger$$

for the rest of this section.

Lemma 10.2. *Fix $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ and a (horizontal) $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$. If $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed, there is a (horizontal) rational $[\alpha'_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ such that*

(1) *$(K;[\alpha'_*])$ is gluing unobstructed;*

(2) *$[\alpha'_j] = [\alpha_j]$ if $[\alpha_j]$ is rational;*

(3) *if $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational, then $[\alpha'_j]$ can be chosen to lie in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of $[\alpha_j]$ in $\mathcal{S}(T_j)$ and to have distance at least 2 to the Seifert fibre of a piece of W containing T_j.*

Proof. First we show that the lemma holds if we replace (1) by (1)′: *$(K;[\alpha'_*])$ is gluing coherent.* The modified lemma is immediate if Proposition 6.6(1) holds for each $(K_i;[\alpha_*^{(i)}])$. Otherwise, the pieces M_i of W for which Proposition 6.6(2) holds occur in linear subtrees of the JSJ graph of W, the vertices

of which correspond to the type of pieces described in Proposition 6.6(2) and whose edges correspond to tori T_j such that $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational. In this situation, Proposition 6.6 implies that we can replace the irrational $[\alpha_j]$ which occur in this linear subtree by horizontal rational slopes of the sort claimed in the lemma.

Let $[\alpha'_*]$ satisfy (1)′, (2), and (3) and suppose that $j \in K([\alpha'_*]) \setminus K$. Then there is an i such that $M_i([(\alpha'_*)^{K_i}]_{rat}) \cong S^1 \times D^2$ where $T_j = \partial M_i([(\alpha'_*)^{K_i}]_{rat})$. If $[(\alpha'_*)^{K_i}]_{rat} = [\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat}$, then $j \in K([\alpha_*])$. On the other hand, if $[(\alpha'_*)^{K_i}]_{rat} \neq [\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat}$, then at least one coordinate of $[\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat}$ is irrational. Condition (3) of the lemma implies that at most one coordinate is irrational. It follows that $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat}) \cong S^1 \times S^1 \times I$. Since $(K_i; [\alpha_*^{(i)}])$ is foliation detected in M_i, $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational (Proposition A.3). Thus $j \in K^\dagger = K$, a contradiction. It follows that $K([\alpha'_*]) \subseteq K([\alpha_*])$. By assumption, $(K([\alpha_*])_i; [\alpha_*^{(i)}])$ is gluing detected for each i, and therefore so is $(K([\alpha'_*])_i; [\alpha_*^{(i)}])$. Since $[\alpha'_*]$ is obtained from $[\alpha_*]$ by changing irrational coordinates to rational ones, and since $K = K^\dagger$, it follows that $(K([\alpha'_*])_i; [(\alpha'_*)^{(i)}])$ is gluing coherent. Thus (1) holds, which completes the proof. □

Lemma 10.3. *Suppose that V is a graph manifold rational homology solid torus with boundary T_0 and JSJ tori $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m$. Fix $K \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and let $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_0], [\alpha_1], \dots, [\alpha_m])$ be a family of rational slopes respectively on $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_m$ such that $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent and $[\alpha_0] \neq [\lambda_V]$. Then there is a one-parameter family $\{[\alpha_*(t)]\}_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ of slopes such that*

- *$(K; [\alpha_*(t)])$ is gluing coherent for all t;*
- *$[\alpha_*(0)] = [\alpha_*]$;*
- *$[\alpha_*(t)]$ is rational if and only if t is rational;*
- *the correspondence $t \mapsto [\alpha_j(t)]$ is injective if $j = 0$ and either injective or constant in general.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that α_i is a primitive element of $H_1(T_i)$ for each i. We induct on the number of pieces $p \geq 1$ of V.

If $p = 1$, the base orbifold of V must be orientable, as otherwise $[\alpha_0] = [\lambda_V]$ by Proposition 6.5. The result now follows from the Appendix since the set of (strongly) detected slopes on ∂V is a connected interval of horizontal slopes containing both $[\alpha_0]$ and $[\lambda_V] \neq [\alpha_0]$.

Assume next that $p > 1$ and let M_0 be the piece of V containing ∂V. After reindexing, we can assume that $\partial M_0 = T_0 \cup T_1 \cup \ldots \cup T_r$ where $r \geq 1$. Let $[\alpha_*^{(0)}]$ denote the projection of $[\alpha_*]$ to $\mathcal{S}(M_0)$. We consider two cases.

Case 1. $v([\alpha_*^{(0)}]) > 0$

Let h be the the class carried by a Seifert fibre of M_0. If $[\alpha_0] \neq [h]$ or the base orbifold of M_0 is orientable and $v(([\alpha_1], [\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r])) \geq 2$ we are done by Proposition 6.5. If $[\alpha_0] = [h]$, the base orbifold of M_0 must be orientable since $[\alpha_0] \neq [\lambda_V]$. Hence we can assume that $[\alpha_1] = [h]$ and $[\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r]$ are horizontal. Then, up to sign, $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 \in H_1(V; \mathbb{Q})$. By hypothesis $\alpha_0 \neq 0 \in H_1(V; \mathbb{Q})$, so $\alpha_1 \neq 0 \in H_1(V_1; \mathbb{Q})$, where V_1 is the submanifold of V with boundary T_1. Since V_1 is a graph manifold rational homology solid torus with fewer pieces than V and $(K; [\alpha_*])$ induces a gluing coherent family of rational slopes $(K_1; [\alpha_*^{(1)}])$ on the union of T_1 and the JSJ tori of V_1 for which $[\alpha_1] \neq [\lambda_{V_1}]$, our inductive hypothesis implies that there is a one-parameter family $\{[\alpha_*^{(1)}(t)]\}_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ of gluing coherent slopes such that

- $(K_1; [\alpha_*^{(1)}(t)])$ is gluing coherent for all t;
- $[\alpha_*^{(1)}(0)] = [\alpha_1]$;
- $[\alpha_*^{(1)}(t)]$ is rational if and only if t is rational;
- the correspondence $t \mapsto [\alpha_j^{(1)}(t)]$ is injective if $j = 1$ and either injective or constant in general.

We show how to extend this sequence to one of the type posited in the statement of the lemma.

Fix primitive classes $\beta_i \in H_1(T_i)$ $(i = 0, 1)$ such that there is an incompressible horizontal surface in M_0 of slope $([\beta_0], [\beta_1], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r])$. Then $\{\alpha_i, \beta_i\}$ is a basis of $H_1(T_i; \mathbb{Q})$ for $i = 0, 1$. Fix non-zero integers $b_0, b_1, a_2, \ldots, a_r$ such that $b_0\beta_0 + b_1\beta_1 + a_2\alpha_2 + \ldots + a_r\alpha_r = 0 \in H_1(M_0)$. As the correspondence $t \mapsto [\alpha_1^{(1)}(t)]$ is injective, we can write $[\alpha_1^{(1)}(t)] = [c(t)h + \beta_1]$ for $t > 0$ where $c(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and the map $t \mapsto c(t)$ is continuous and preserves rational and irrational numbers. Since $\lim_{t\to 0}[\alpha_1^{(1)}(t)] = [\alpha_1] = [h]$ we have $\lim_{t\to 0} |c(t)| = +\infty$. Define

$$\alpha_0(t) = \beta_0 - c(t)\big(\frac{b_1}{b_0}\big)h \neq 0 \in H_1(T_0; \mathbb{R})$$

for $t > 0$ and $\alpha_0(0) = h$, observe that $\lim_{t\to 0}[\alpha_0(t)] = \lim_{t\to 0}[\beta_0 - c(t)h] = [h] = [\alpha_0]$. Further $[\alpha_0(t)]$ is rational for rational t and the identity $b_0\alpha_0(t) + b_1\alpha_1^{(1)}(t) + a_2\alpha_2 + \ldots + a_r\alpha_r = 0 \in H_1(M_0)$ holds. Thus $(K; ([\alpha_0(t)], [\alpha_1^{(1)}(t)], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r]))$ is foliation detected in M_0 for each t. (Note that $0 \notin K$ by Proposition 6.4.) Moreover, for rational t, there is a horizontal surface in M_0 whose slope is $([\alpha_0(t)], [\alpha_1^{(1)}(t)], [\alpha_2], \ldots, [\alpha_r])$ which is a fibre in a fibration of M_0 over the circle. Now define $[\alpha_*(t)]$ to be the extension of $[\alpha_*^{(1)}(t)]$ which equals $[\alpha_0(t)]$ on T_0 and $[\alpha_i]$ for T_i neither T_0, nor T_1, nor a JSJ torus of V_1. Then $(K; [\alpha_*(t)])$ is a one-parameter family of gluing coherent slopes which converges to $[\alpha_*]$ and is rational for rational t. Finally as $-b_0\alpha_0(t) = b_1\alpha_1^{(1)}(t) + a_2\alpha_2 + \ldots + a_r\alpha_r$, the map $t \mapsto [\alpha_0(t)]$ is injective.

Case 2. $v([\alpha_*^{(0)}]) = 0$

In this case $[\alpha_*^{(0)}]$ is horizontal in M_0. It follows from Proposition 6.2 that $[\alpha_*^{(0)}]$ is $\mathcal{F}_0$-detected where $\mathcal{F}_0$ is horizontal in M_0. Since $\mathcal{F}_0$ is co-oriented, the Seifert fibres of M_0 can be coherently oriented. Hence the base orbifold of M_0 is orientable.

For $1 \leq j \leq r$, let $\tau_j \in \mathbb{R}$ be determined by the identity $[\alpha_j] = [\tau_j h - h_j^*]$ and define

$$\mathcal{S}(M_0; ([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_r])) = \{[\tau' h - h_0] : \tau' \in \mathcal{T}(M_0; K_0; (\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_r))\}$$

where $K_0 = K \cap \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ (cf. the Appendix). Our hypotheses imply that $[\alpha_0]$ is contained in the interval $\mathcal{S}(M_0; ([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_r]))$. If $\mathcal{S}(M_0; ([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_r]))$ is a non-degenerate interval, whose interior corresponds to strong detection, it is easy to see that we are done. Otherwise $\mathcal{S}(M_0; ([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_r])) = \{[\alpha_0]\}$ (Propositions A.3 and A.4). There is a primitive horizontal class $\beta_0 \in H_1(T_0)$ and non-zero integers $b_0, a_1, \ldots, a_r$ such that $b_0\beta_0 + a_1\alpha_1 + a_2\alpha_2 + \ldots + a_r\alpha_r = 0 \in H_1(M_0)$. Hence $\{[\beta_0]\} \in \mathcal{S}(M_0; ([\alpha_1], \ldots, [\alpha_r])) = \{[\alpha_0]\}$ and so without loss of generality $\beta_0 = \alpha_0$. As α_0 is non-zero in $H_1(V)$, there is an $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ such that $\alpha_i \neq 0 \in H_1(V_i; \mathbb{Q})$ where V_i is the submanifold of V with boundary T_i. After reindexing we can suppose that $i = 1$. Since V_1 is a graph manifold rational homology solid torus with fewer pieces than V and $(K; [\alpha_*])$ induces a gluing coherent family of rational slopes $(K_1; [\alpha_*^{(1)}])$ on the union of T_1 and the JSJ tori of V_1 such that $[\alpha_1] \neq [\lambda_{V_1}]$, our inductive hypothesis implies that there is a one-parameter family $\{[\alpha_*^{(1)}(t)]\}_{0\leq t\leq 1}$ of gluing coherent slopes such that

- $(K_1; [\alpha_*^{(1)}(t)])$ is gluing coherent for all t;
- $[\alpha_*^{(1)}(0)] = [\alpha_1]$;
- $[\alpha_*^{(1)}(t)]$ is rational if and only if t is rational;
- the correspondence $t \mapsto [\alpha_j^{(1)}(t)]$ is injective if $j = 1$ and either injective or constant in general.

By construction $\{\alpha_i, h\}$ is a basis of $H_1(T_i; \mathbb{Q})$ for $i = 1, 2$. Hence as $[\alpha_1^{(1)}(t)] \neq [\alpha_1]$ we can write $\alpha_1^{(1)}(t) = \alpha_1 + c(t)h$ where $c(t)$ is a continuous real-valued function which takes rational numbers to rational numbers. Further $c(0) = 0$. Define

$$\alpha_0(t) = \alpha_0 - c(t)\big(\frac{a_1}{b_0}\big)h \neq 0 \in H_1(T_0)$$

and observe that $[\alpha_0(0)] = [\alpha_0]$ and $b_0\alpha_0(t) + a_1\alpha_1^{(1)}(t) + a_2\alpha_2 + \ldots + a_r\alpha_r = 0 \in H_1(M_0)$ for each t. Now proceed as in Case 1 to produce the desired one-parameter family $[\alpha_*(t)]$. □

Suppose, under the assumptions of the previous lemma, that M_i is a JSJ piece of V and $T_j \subseteq \partial M_i$. Let $[h_i] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j)$ be the Seifert slope of M_i. Then it is straightforward to verify that

$$\{[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T) : [\alpha] \text{ is rational and } \Delta([\alpha],[h_i]) \leq 1\}$$

is a closed subset of $\mathcal{S}(T)$ whose only limit point is $[h]$. Here is a simple consequence of this observation.

Addendum 10.4. *Let $t \mapsto [\alpha_*(t)]$ be the 1-parameter family of slopes constructed in Lemma 10.3. Then the set of rational t for which there is a j such that the correspondence $t \mapsto [\alpha_j^{(1)}(t)]$ is injective and there is a JSJ piece M_i of W incident to T_j such that $\Delta([\alpha],[h_i]) \leq 1$, is closed with only finitely many limit points.* □

Lemma 10.5. *Fix $K \subseteq \{1,2,\ldots,m\}$ and suppose that there is a rational $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ such that $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed. Let $M_1,\ldots,M_s$ be the pieces of W which fibre over S^1 with fibre a surface having connected boundary and assume that we have indexed the JSJ tori of W so that $T_i = \partial M_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. Then there is a rational $[\alpha'_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ such that*

(1) *$[\alpha'_i]$ is horizontal in a piece of W incident to T_i whenever $[\alpha_i]$ has this property;*

(2) *if $[\alpha'_i] \neq [\alpha_i]$, then the distance of $[\alpha'_i]$ to the Seifert fibre of a piece of W containing T_i is at least 2;*

(3) *for $1 \leq i \leq s$, $[\alpha'_i] \neq [\lambda_{M_i}]$ and $[\alpha'_i]$ is strongly detected in M_i;*

(4) *if $v([\alpha_*^{(i)}]) > 0$, then $v([(\alpha'_*)^{(i)}])$ is even if M_i has orientable base orbifold and odd otherwise.*

(5) *$(K;[\alpha'_*])$ is gluing unobstructed.*

Proof. First we find a rational $[\alpha'_*]$ so that (1), (2), (3), and (5) hold. Set $K' = K([\alpha_*])$.

Suppose that $[\alpha_i] = [\lambda_{M_i}]$ for some $i \in \{1,\ldots,s\}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $[\alpha_i] = [\lambda_{M_i}]$ for $1 \leq i \leq s_0$ and $[\alpha_i] \neq [\lambda_{M_i}]$ for $s_0+1 \leq i \leq s$. Let $V = \overline{W \setminus M_1}$ and observe that as $[\alpha_1] = [\lambda_{M_1}]$ and W is a rational homology 3-sphere, $[\alpha_1] \neq [\lambda_V]$. Hence by Lemma 10.3 we can find a one-parameter family $\{[\alpha_*(t)]\}_{t>0}$ of slopes such that

- $(K';[\alpha_*(t)])$ is gluing coherent on V for all t;
- $\lim_{t\to 0}[\alpha_*(t)] = [\alpha_*]$;
- $[\alpha_*(t)]$ is rational for rational t;
- the correspondence $t \mapsto [\alpha_j(t)]$ is injective if $j = 1$ and either injective or constant in general.

By Lemma 6.11(3), we can assume that $[\alpha_1(t)]$ is strongly foliation detected in M_1 for all t, and therefore $(K';[\alpha_*(t)])$ is gluing coherent on W. Then for rational values of t close, but not equal, to 0, we have $[\alpha_1(t)] \neq [\lambda_{M_1}]$. Being horizontal is an open condition, so (1) holds for $[\alpha_i(t)]$ when t is small. Addendum 10.4 implies that the distance of $[\alpha_i(t)]$ to the Seifert fibre of a piece of W containing T_i is at least 2, for generic, rational t which is close to 0, whenever $[\alpha_i(t)] \neq [\alpha_i]$. We claim that for such a t, t_0 say, $(K;[\alpha_*(t_0)])$ is gluing unobstructed. This will follow if we can show that $K([\alpha_*(t_0)]) \subseteq K' = K([\alpha_*])$, for $(K';[\alpha_*(t_0)])$ is gluing coherent by construction, and therefore so is $(K([\alpha_*(t_0)]);[\alpha_*(t_0)])$.

Let K'' denote $K([\alpha_*(t_0)])$ and suppose that $j \in K'' \setminus K$. Then there is some i such that $M_i([\alpha_*(t_0)^{K_i}]) \cong S^1 \times D^2$. Up to reindexing the JSJ tori of W, we can suppose that $\partial M_i = T_0 \cup T_1 \cup \ldots \cup T_r$ and $j = 0$. Since $r \geq 1$, $M_i \ncong N_2$, and as $K_i = \{1,\ldots,r\}$, $([\alpha_1(t)],\ldots,[\alpha_r(t)])$ is horizontal in M_i for all t. Thus $M_i([\alpha_*(t_0)^{K_i}]) \cong S^1 \times D^2$ inherits a Seifert structure from M_i, and therefore the base orbifold of M_i is orientable. Further, the base orbifold of $M_i([\alpha_*(t_0)^{K_i}])$ has at most one exceptional fibre. If one, then $\Delta([\alpha_j(t_0)],[h_i]) = 1$, and therefore $[\alpha_j(t_0)] = [\alpha_j]$, for $1 \leq j \leq r$. Thus $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]) \cong S^1 \times D^2$, so $j \in K'$. If the base orbifold of $M_i([\alpha_*(t_0)^{K_i}])$ has no exceptional fibres, then $\Delta([\alpha_j(t_0)],[h_i]) > 1$ for at most

one $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, say $\Delta([\alpha_j(t_0)], [h_i]) = 1$ for $j \in \{2, \dots, r\}$. Then $[\alpha_j(t_0)] = [\alpha_j]$, for $2 \leq j \leq r$, so $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]) \cong S^1 \times D^2$ and as before, $j \in K'$. Thus $K'' = K \cup (K'' \setminus K) \subseteq K \cup (K' \setminus K) = K'$.

Since (1) and (2) are open properties, as is the property of not being a rational longitude, we can proceed inductively to show that there is a rational $[\alpha'_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ satisfying (1), (2), (3), and (5). Next we show how to perturb $[\alpha'_*]$ so that assertion (4) also holds.

Suppose that M_i is a JSJ piece of W with an orientable base orbifold such that $v([(\alpha'_*)^{(i)}])$ is odd. Then $v([(\alpha'_*)^{(i)}]) \geq 3$ by Proposition 6.5. Reindex the JSJ tori of W so that $\partial M_i = T_1 \cup \ldots \cup T_r$ and $[\alpha'_j]$ is vertical in M_i if and only if $1 \leq j \leq s$. Since W is a rational homology 3-sphere, there is at most one $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $[\alpha'_j]$ is the rational longitude of the component V_j, of W split open along T_j, which does not contain M_i. Then, without loss of generality, we can suppose that $[\alpha'_s] \neq [\lambda_{V_s}]$. Apply Lemma 10.3 to V_s, as above, and Proposition 6.5(2) to perturb $[\alpha'_*]$ in such a way that assertions (1), (2), (3), and (5) still hold, while $[\alpha'_j]$ is now horizontal in M_i. (This operation need only alter the components of $[\alpha'_*]$ corresponding to the JSJ tori of W contained in V_s.) We have reduced $v([(\alpha'_*)^{(i)}])$ by 1, so it is now even. A similar argument, which we leave to the reader, deals with the case that M_i is a JSJ piece of W with a non-orientable base orbifold such that $v([(\alpha'_*)^{(l)}]) > 0$ is even. The proof is completed using induction. □

Proof of the foliation case of Theorem 9.5. First suppose that $K = \emptyset$ and a gluing coherent family of rational slopes $[\alpha_*]$ satisfying the conclusions of Lemma 10.5. Fix foliations $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}(\rho_i)$ which detect $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$, where ρ_i is chosen as in Proposition 6.7. If some $\mathcal{F}_i$ has a compact horizontal leaf F, F is a fibre in some fibring of M_i over the circle. In this case, replace $\mathcal{F}_i$ by the fibring. By our choice of $[\alpha_*]$, no $\mathcal{F}_i$ has a compact horizontal leaf with connected boundary. Further, $v([\alpha_*^{(i)}])$ is even if M_i has an orientable base orbifold and $v([\alpha_*^{(i)}])$ is odd if it is positive and M_i has a non-orientable base orbifold. By Lemmas 6.10, 6.11 and 6.12 we can find an odd integer $k \gg 0$ and foliations $\mathcal{F}'_i$ on each M_i which are k interval-hyperbolic on each component of ∂M_i. By Lemma 6.9 we can piece these foliations together along the tori T_j to obtain a co-oriented taut foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on W.

Next suppose that $K \neq \emptyset$ and choose $[\alpha_*]$ satisfying the conclusions of Lemma 10.5. Let $K' = K'([\alpha_*])$ and consider the manifold obtained by cutting W open along the components T_j of $\mathcal{T}$ for $j \in K'$. The boundary of the resulting manifold is a disjoint union of tori, two for each T_j where $j \in K'$. Dehn fill the boundary components along the slopes $[\alpha_j]$ for $j \in K'$ to produce a graph manifold W' with two or more components whose pieces are of the form $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}])$ for some i. Each of these pieces is Seifert and none are solid tori. (This is where we use the the assumption that K is gluing unobstructed.) We can produce a co-oriented taut foliation on each component of W' by applying the case $K = \emptyset$ of the previous paragraph. Moreover, we can suppose that the resulting foliations are transverse to the cores of the filling tori of $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}])$ (cf. Lemma 6.12). Hence, after an isotopy, we can suppose that they intersect each M_i in co-oriented taut foliations which restrict to linear foliations of slope $[\alpha_j]$ on T_j whenever $j \in K$. Thus we can piece together the resulting foliations on the pieces of W to produce a K-type co-oriented taut foliation on W. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 1.4. If W admits a (horizontal) K-type co-oriented taut foliation, there is a (horizontal) $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ such that $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed (Theorem 9.5). By Lemma 10.5 we can suppose that $[\alpha_*]$ is rational (and horizontal) and $(K, [\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed. Then Theorem 9.5 implies that there is a (horizontal) K-type co-oriented taut foliation which intersects each JSJ torus in a foliation of rational slope. □

11. Proof of the gluing theorem: the left-order case

We review the standard notation for graphs of groups, and the theorems available to us. Our notation follows [Se, Ch], modified slightly since we are only concerned with trees of groups.

Given a graph Y with vertices $v \in V(Y)$ and edges $e \in E(Y)$, there are functions $o, t : E(Y) \to V(Y)$, the origin and tail of each edge. The notation $\bar{e}$ indicates the edge e with opposite orientation, so that $o(\bar{e}) = t(e)$, $t(\bar{e}) = o(e)$. For every graph of groups (G, Y) there are edge groups $\{G_e | e \in E(Y)\}$ and vertex groups $\{G_v | v \in V(Y)\}$, together with injective maps $\phi_e : G_e \to G_{t(e)}$ for all $e \in E(Y)$. We require $G_{\bar{e}} = G_e$.

The fundamental group of a graph of groups (G, Y) is written $\pi_1(G, Y, T)$ where T is a maximal tree in the graph Y, but we need only consider the case where Y is a tree (and hence the maximal tree T is Y itself). We write $\pi_1(G, T)$ for the fundamental group of a tree of groups. If the tree has edges $E(T)$ and vertices $V(T)$, then $\pi_1(G, T)$ has presentation

$$\langle G_v, v \in V(T) | \text{rel}(G_v), v \in V(T) \text{ and } \phi_e(g) = \phi_{\bar{e}}(g) \text{ for all } g \in G_e \text{ and } e \in E(T) \rangle$$

If H is left-orderable and $\phi : G \to H$ is injective, then every left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ of H induces a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}^\phi$ on G according to the rule $g <^\phi h$ if and only if $\phi(g) < \phi(h)$. When $\phi(h) = ghg^{-1}$ is an inner automorphism, $\mathfrak{o}^\phi$ is denoted by $\mathfrak{o}^g$, and $h_1 <^g h_2$ if and only if $gh_1g^{-1} < gh_2g^{-1}$, or $h_1g^{-1} < h_2g^{-1}$. The following definitions are from [Ch].

Definition 11.1. A family of left-orderings $\mathcal{L} \subset LO(G)$ is called *normal in* G if it is non-empty, and for all $g \in G$ if $\mathfrak{o} \in \mathcal{L}$ then $\mathfrak{o}^g \in \mathcal{L}$.

Definition 11.2. Let $H_i \subset G_i$ be groups with left-orderings $\mathfrak{o}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose that $\phi : H_1 \to H_2$ is an isomorphism. Then ϕ is *compatible* for the pair $(\mathfrak{o}_1, \mathfrak{o}_2)$ if for all $h \in H_1$, $1 <_1 h$ implies $1 <_2 \phi(h)$. If $\mathcal{L}_i$ is a family of left-orderings of the group G_i, then ϕ is *compatible* for the pair $(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2)$ if for all $\mathfrak{o}_1 \in \mathcal{L}_1$ there exists $\mathfrak{o}_2 \in \mathcal{L}_2$ such that ϕ is compatible for the pair $(\mathfrak{o}_1, \mathfrak{o}_2)$.

We need to extend these definitions to graphs of groups.

Definition 11.3. Suppose that (G, Y) is a graph of groups, and and suppose that $\{\mathcal{L}_v | v \in V(Y)\}$ is a family of sets of left-orderings of the vertex groups G_v. The family $\{\mathcal{L}_v | v \in V(Y)\}$ is said to be normal if $\mathcal{L}_v$ is *normal* in G_v for all $v \in V(Y)$.

Definition 11.4. Suppose that (G, Y) is a graph of groups, and for each $v \in V(Y)$ let $\mathfrak{o}_v$ be a left-ordering of G_v. The family of left-orderings $\{\mathfrak{o}_v | v \in V(Y)\}$ is said to be *compatible* for (G, Y) if $\phi_e \phi_{\bar{e}}^{-1}$ is compatible for the pair $(\mathfrak{o}_{o(e)}, \mathfrak{o}_{t(e)})$ for all $e \in E(Y)$. More generally, suppose that $\{\mathcal{L}_v | v \in V(Y)\}$ is a family of sets of left-orderings of the vertex groups G_v. The family $\{\mathcal{L}_v | v \in V(Y)\}$ is said to be *compatible* for (G, Y) if for every $e \in E(Y)$, $\phi_e \phi_{\bar{e}}^{-1}$ is compatible for $(\mathcal{L}_{o(e)}, \mathcal{L}_{t(e)})$.

The main criterion we will use to show the existence of certain types of left-orderings of $\pi_1(W)$, where W is a graph manifold as in Section 2.3, is the following:

Theorem 11.5. [Ch, Lemma 2.2] *Suppose that Y is a finite tree, and (G, Y) is a graph of groups and $\{\mathcal{L}_v | v \in V(Y)\}$ is a normal family of left-orderings that are compatible for (G, Y). Then $\pi_1(G, Y)$ is left-orderable. Moreover for each $v \in V(Y)$ let $\mathfrak{o}_v \in \mathcal{L}_v$ be a left-ordering of G_v such that $\{\mathfrak{o}_v | v \in V(Y)\}$ is compatible for (G, Y). Then there exists a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ of $\pi_1(G, Y)$ that restricts to $\mathfrak{o}_v$ on G_v for all $v \in V$.*

In the context of graph manifolds, our edge groups will always be $\pi_1(T_j)$ for some JSJ torus $T_j \subset W$, so we introduce notation in order to analyze the left-orderings of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$.

If $\mathfrak{o}$ is a left-ordering of a group, recall we denote the opposite ordering by $\mathfrak{o}_{op}$. Given $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T)$, if $[\alpha]$ is rational there are four left-orderings of $\pi_1(T)$ that detect the slope $[\alpha]$, if $[\alpha]$ is irrational there are two. The four possible left-orderings are $\mathfrak{o}(\alpha)$ and $\mathfrak{o}_{op}(\alpha)$, where $\mathfrak{o}(\alpha)$ has positive cone $\{(m, n) | \frac{n}{m} \neq \alpha \text{ and } n - \alpha m \geq 0\}$; and $\overline{\mathfrak{o}}(\alpha)$, $\overline{\mathfrak{o}}_{op}(\alpha)$ where $\overline{\mathfrak{o}}(\alpha)$ has positive cone $\{(m, n) | \frac{n}{m} \neq \alpha \text{ and } n - \alpha m \leq 0\}$. For $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T)$, set

$$\mathfrak{O}(\alpha) = \{\mathfrak{o}(\alpha), \mathfrak{o}_{op}(\alpha), \overline{\mathfrak{o}}(\alpha), \overline{\mathfrak{o}}_{op}(\alpha)\}$$

Note that when $[\alpha]$ is irrational the orderings $\mathfrak{o}(\alpha)$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{o}}(\alpha)$ coincide.

Definition 11.6. Let M be a 3-manifold with torus boundary components $T_1, \dots, T_r$ as in Section 2.2. A family of left-orderings $\mathcal{L}$ of $\pi_1(M)$ is said to be *ready for gluing along* $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1], \dots, [\alpha_r])$ if $\mathcal{L}$ is normal, and for all $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$

$$\{\mathfrak{o} \in LO(\pi_1(T_j))|\ \mathfrak{o} = \mathfrak{o}'|\pi_1(T_j) \text{ for some } \mathfrak{o}' \in \mathcal{L}\} = \mathfrak{O}(\alpha_j)$$

If W is a graph manifold as in Section 2.3, then the JSJ decomposition induces the structure of a graph of groups on $\pi_1(W)$. Applying Theorem 11.5 in this setting, we have:

Proposition 11.7. *Let $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$. If there exist families $\mathcal{L}_i \subset LO(\pi_1(M_i))$ of left-orderings that are ready for gluing along $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$, then $\pi_1(W)$ is left-orderable. Moreover $\pi_1(W)$ admits a left-ordering extending $\mathfrak{o}_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ whenever $\{\mathfrak{o}_1, \mathfrak{o}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{o}_n\}$ is compatible for the graph of groups structure on $\pi_1(W)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ and $\mathcal{L}_i \subset LO(\pi_1(M_i))$ are ready for gluing along $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$. We need to show that the normal families $\mathcal{L}_i$ are compatible for the graph of groups structure on $\pi_1(W)$. Writing $\partial M_i = T_{i1} \cup \dots \cup T_{ir_i}$, there are maps $f_{ij} : T_{ij} \to M_i$ inducing homomorphisms $\pi_1(T_{ij}) \to \pi_1(M_i)$, these homomorphisms are the edge maps that give $\pi_1(W)$ the structure of a graph of groups.

Compatibility of $\mathcal{L}_i$ for the graph of groups structure on $\pi_1(W)$ is a local condition, in the sense that we need only verify the conditions for an arbitrary edge. So to simplify notation, we fix $T \in \{T_1, \dots, T_m\}$ in $\partial M_i \cap \partial M_j$ with corresponding slope $[\alpha]$, and denote the gluing maps by $f_i : \pi_1(T) \to \pi_1(M_i)$ and $f_j : \pi_1(T) \to \pi_1(M_j)$.

We check compatibility of the normal families $\mathcal{L}_i$ and $\mathcal{L}_j$ with the gluing maps of the torus T. Given $\mathfrak{o}_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$, since $\mathcal{L}_i$ is ready for gluing along $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ the ordering $\mathfrak{o}_i^{f_i}$ detects the slope $[\alpha]$, and thus $\mathfrak{o}_i^{f_i} \in \mathfrak{O}(\alpha)$. Since $\mathcal{L}_j$ is ready for gluing along $[\alpha_*^{(j)}]$, there exists an ordering $\mathfrak{o}_j \in \mathcal{L}_j$ such that $\mathfrak{o}_j^{f_j} = \mathfrak{o}_i^{f_i}$. It follows that $f_j f_i^{-1}$ is compatible for $(\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{L}_j)$, similarly we can show that $f_i f_j^{-1}$ is compatible for $(\mathcal{L}_j, \mathcal{L}_i)$. Therefore $\mathcal{L}_i \subset LO(\pi_1(M_i))$ is compatible for the graph of groups structure on $\pi_1(W)$, and the result follows by Theorem 11.5. □

Thus to prove the gluing theorem we will show that if $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected, then there is a family $\mathcal{L}$ of left-orderings of $\pi_1(M)$ that is ready for gluing along $[\alpha_*]$. We begin with the horizontal case.

Proposition 11.8. *With M as in Section 2.2, suppose that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal and $\mathfrak{o}$-detected. Then there exists a family of left-orderings $\mathcal{L} \subset LO(\pi_1(M))$ that is ready for gluing along $[\alpha_*]$.*

For the proof we prepare some lemmas. Recall that for every boundary torus T_j, $\pi_1(T_j) \cong H_1(T_j)$ is identified with a subgroup of $H_1(T_j; \mathbb{R})$.

Lemma 11.9. *Let $T_j \in \partial M$ and suppose $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal and $\mathfrak{o}$-detected. Then $g \in \pi_1(T_j)$ is cofinal in $\pi_1(M)$ if and only if it is not a power of $\alpha_j(\mathfrak{o})$. In particular, if $\mathfrak{o}'$ is a left-ordering having the same set of cofinal elements as $\mathfrak{o}$, then $\mathfrak{o}'$ detects $[\alpha_*]$.*

Proof. If $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal and $\mathfrak{o}$-detected, by Proposition 4.7 M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and the fibre slope h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $\pi_1(M)$. Then any $g \in \pi_1(T_j)$ that is is not a power of $\alpha_j(\mathfrak{o})$ is cofinal in $\pi_1(T_j)$, so for all n there exists k such that $g^{-k} < h^n < g^k$ and thus g is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $\pi_1(M)$. On the other hand if g is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $\pi_1(M)$ it cannot be a power of $\alpha_j(\mathfrak{o})$, which is bounded since $[\alpha_j(\mathfrak{o})]$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-detected. □

Lemma 11.10. *Suppose that a group G admits a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$. Let $g \in G$ be given. If $\{g^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is bounded above by f, then there exists a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}'$ of G and a $\mathfrak{o}'$-convex subgroup $C \subset G$ with $g \in C$ and $f \notin C$. Moreover, every positive $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal element of G is positive and $\mathfrak{o}'$-cofinal.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{g^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is bounded above in the ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ by $f \in G$. Consider the family of sets $\mathcal{X} = \{S \subset G | x \in S \text{ and } y < x \Rightarrow y \in S\}$, ordered by inclusion. It is not hard to check that G acts on $\mathcal{X}$

in an order-preserving way. Set $X_0 = \{x \in G | x < g^k \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, and define a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}'$ of G as follows. Given $h \in G$ declare $h >' 1$ if either $X_0 \subset h(X_0)$ or $h(X_0) = X_0$ and $h > 1$. One can verify that the subgroup $C = \mathrm{Stab}_G(X_0)$ is convex in the ordering $\mathfrak{o}'$, and contains g but not f.

Now suppose that h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal and $h > 1$. To show that h is $\mathfrak{o}'$-positive and $\mathfrak{o}'$-cofinal, let $x \in G$ be given. Choose $n > 0$ such that $xf < h^n$, so that $f < x^{-1}h^n$. Since f is an upper bound for $\{g^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ this means that $x^{-1}h^n$ is also an upper bound for X_0. We conclude that $X_0 \subset x^{-1}h^n(X_0)$, so that $1 <' x^{-1}h^n$. In other words, $x <' h^n$ and so h is $\mathfrak{o}'$-cofinal. Choosing $x = 1$ in the previous argument shows $h >' 1$. □

Proof of Proposition 11.8. Suppose that $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(M)$ is horizontal and $\mathfrak{o}$-detected. We construct a family $\mathcal{L}$ of left-orderings of $\pi_1(M)$ that is ready for gluing along $[\alpha_*]$ as follows. Set $S_0 = \{\mathfrak{o}, \mathfrak{o}_{op}\}$, and for $j = 1, \dots, r$ define the set S_j inductively as follows.

If $[\alpha_j]$ is irrational then $S_j = S_{j-1}$. Otherwise if $[\alpha_j]$ is rational we create new left-orderings of $\pi_1(M)$ as follows. Since $\{\alpha_j^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \subset \pi_1(M)$ is bounded above in the ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ (by the fibre slope h, for example), we apply Lemma 11.10 to create a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}'$ of $\pi_1(M)$ with a proper, $\mathfrak{o}'$-convex subgroup C containing $[\alpha_j]$ but not h. By construction, the positive $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal elements of $\pi_1(M)$ are again positive and $\mathfrak{o}'$-cofinal, hence by Lemma 11.9 the left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}'$ detects the tuple $[\alpha_*]$. Since C is convex, the left cosets $\pi_1(M)/C$ can be given a left-invariant total order. Define S_j to be S_{j-1} together with the four possible lexicographic left-orderings that arise from the sequence

$$1 \to C \to \pi_1(M) \to \pi_1(M)/C \to 1$$

By construction every left-ordering in S_r has the same set of cofinal elements as $\mathfrak{o}$ and so detects $[\alpha_*]$ by Lemma 11.9. Set

$$\mathcal{L} = \bigcup_{g\in\pi_1(M)} gS_rg^{-1}$$

By construction $\mathfrak{O}(\alpha_j) \subset \{\mathfrak{o} \in \mathrm{LO}(\pi_1(T_j)) |\ \mathfrak{o} = \mathfrak{o}'|\pi_1(T_j) \text{ for some } \mathfrak{o}' \in \mathcal{L}\}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is normal. An arbitrary left-ordering of $\mathcal{L}$ is of the form $\mathfrak{o}^g$ for some $g \in \pi_1(M)$ and $\mathfrak{o} \in S_r$. Note that since h is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal it is also $\mathfrak{o}^g$ cofinal, so by Lemma 4.6(2) $\mathfrak{o}$ and $\mathfrak{o}^g$ have the same cofinal elements. By Lemma 11.9 we conclude that $\mathfrak{o}^g$ detects $[\alpha_*]$, and so $\mathfrak{O}(\alpha_j) = \{\mathfrak{o} \in \mathrm{LO}(\pi_1(T_j)) |\ \mathfrak{o} = \mathfrak{o}'|\pi_1(T_j) \text{ for some } \mathfrak{o}' \in \mathcal{L}\}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is ready for gluing. □

Next we construct ready for gluing families when $[\alpha_*]$ is not horizontal.

Lemma 11.11. (cf. Lemma 4.9) *Suppose that M has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ with $r \geq 2$ boundary tori. If $r = 2$ then there exists a family of left-orderings $\mathcal{L}$ ready for gluing along $([h], [h])$; if $r \geq 3$ then for each $[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T_r)$ there exists a family $\mathcal{L}$ of left-orderings of $\pi_1(M)$ that is ready for gluing along $([h], \dots, [h], [\alpha])$.*

Proof. If $r = 2$ or if $r \geq 3$ and $[\alpha] = [h]$, consider the short exact sequence

$$1 \to K \to \pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}^{r-1} \to 1$$

as in Lemma 4.9. Let $\mathcal{L}$ denote the set of all lexicographic left-orderings of $\pi_1(M)$ arising from pairs $(\mathfrak{o}', \mathfrak{o})$, where $\mathfrak{o}' \in LO(K)$ and $\mathfrak{o} \in LO(\mathbb{Z}^{r-1})$. Note that every left-ordering in $\mathcal{L}$ detects $([h], \dots, [h])$, moreover $\mathcal{L}$ is ready for gluing along $([h], \dots, [h])$.

On the other hand suppose $[\alpha] \neq [h]$ and $r \geq 3$. First we show that there exists a left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ of $\pi_1(M)$ with $[\alpha_*(\mathfrak{o})]$ horizontal and $[\alpha_r(\mathfrak{o})] = [\alpha]$. To see this, set $[\alpha] = [\alpha_r]$ and choose a tuple of horizontal slopes $([\alpha_2], \dots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(T_2) \times \dots \times \mathcal{S}(T_r)$, then applying Proposition A.6 and Proposition 4.5 there exists $\mathfrak{o}$ detecting $([\alpha_1], \dots, [\alpha_r]) \in \mathcal{S}(T_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{S}(T_r)$ for some slope $[\alpha_1]$. The slope $[\alpha_1]$ is horizontal by Lemma 4.11. Now by Proposition 11.8 there exists a family $\mathcal{L}_0$ of left-orderings of $\pi_1(M)$ that is ready for gluing along $([\alpha_1], \dots, [\alpha_r])$.

Consider the short exact sequence $1 \to K \to \pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}^{r-2} \to 1$ where $\pi_1(T_r) \subset K$, $h \in K$ and $\pi_1(T_j) \not\subset K$ for $j \neq r$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ denote the family of all lexicographic left-orderings of $\pi_1(M)$ arising from pairs of orderings $(\mathfrak{o}', \mathfrak{o})$ where $\mathfrak{o}'$ is the restriction to K of an ordering in $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathfrak{o} \in LO(\mathbb{Z}^{r-2})$. By construction $\mathcal{L}$ is normal, and ready for gluing along $([h], \dots, [h], [\alpha])$. □

Lemma 11.12. *Suppose that M is Seifert fibred over $Q(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Then there exists a family of left-orderings $\mathcal{L} \subset LO(\pi_1(M))$ that is ready for gluing along $([h], [h], \dots, [h])$.*

Proof. Note that there is a short exact sequence $1 \to K \to \pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}^r \to 1$ where $h \in K$ and no dual class x_j is killed by the quotient map $\pi_1(M) \to \mathbb{Z}^r$. Now proceed as in the proof of Lemma 11.11. □

Next we include two lemmas that are necessary to show cofinality of the fibre class in certain left-orderings. The proof of the next lemma is straightforward and so we omit it.

Lemma 11.13. *Let G be a group with left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$. If there exists $h \in H$ that is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in G, then every element of H that is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in H is also $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in G.*

Lemma 11.14. *Suppose that G_1, G_2 are groups with a common subgroup H, and let $h_1, h_2 \in H$ be given. Suppose that $\mathfrak{o}$ is a left-ordering of $G_1 *_H G_2$ and that each h_i is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in G_i. If $g \in G_i$ is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in G_i, then g is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $G_1 *_H G_2$.*

Proof. We will begin by showing that h_1 is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $G_1 *_H G_2$, the case of h_2 is identical.

Every element of $G_1 *_H G_2$ can be represented by a word w in normal form

$$w = g_1 g_2 \dots g_k h$$

where g_j and g_{j+1} are never elements of the same G_i, and $h \in H$. We need to show that there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h_1^{-n} < w < h_1^n$, we proceed by induction on k. From Lemma 11.13 we know that h_1 is cofinal in both G_1 and G_2, so if $k = 1$ then $g_1 h$ is an element of either G_1 or G_2 and such an n exists.

Assume for induction that such an n exists for all words of length $k-1$ or less. Set $w = gw'$ where w' is length $k-1$. If $g \in G_1$ then choose n such that $h_1^{-n} < w' < h_1^n$ and r such that $gh_1^n < h_1^r$, the latter choice is possible since $gh_1^n \in G_1$ and h_1 is cofinal in G_1. Then we get an upper bound $w = gw' < gh_1^n < h_1^r$. On the other hand, if $g \in G_2$ then $gh_1^n \in G_2$. Since h_1 is cofinal in G_2 we can make an identical argument to bound w above in this case. Similar arguments allow us to bound w below by a power of h_1 and cofinality of h_1 follows.

Now let $g \in G_i$ be given. Since g is cofinal in G_i for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $g^{-n} < h_i^k < g^n$. Since h_i is $\mathfrak{o}$-cofinal in $G_1 *_H G_2$ it follows that g is as well. □

Proof of the order gluing theorem when $K = \emptyset$. If $\pi_1(W)$ is left-orderable with ordering $\mathfrak{o}$, then $\mathfrak{o}$ detects some $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$. For each i, the restriction ordering $\mathfrak{o}_i$ of $\pi_1(M_i)$ detects $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$. Moreover if every class represented by the Seifert fibre of a piece is cofinal in $\pi_1(W)$, then the class of the fibre of M_i is cofinal in $\pi_1(M_i)$. Thus $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ is horizontal for all i, so $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal.

Conversely suppose we are given $[\alpha_*] \in \mathcal{S}(W; \mathcal{T})$ and for each i the ordering $\mathfrak{o}_i$ of $\pi_1(M_i)$ detects $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$. We refine the decomposition of W into Seifert fibred pieces by cutting each M_i along vertical tori, depending on whether or not $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ is horizontal. If M_i is a Seifert fibred piece for which $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ is horizontal or vertical, we make no refinement. Otherwise when $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$ is neither horizontal or vertical there are two cases (cf. Proposition 4.11):

Case 1. M_i has base orbifold $P(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $r_i \geq 3$. Set $v = v([\alpha_*^{(i)}]) \geq 2$ and index the boundary tori so that $\mathfrak{o}_i$ detects $[h]$ on $T_{i1}, \dots, T_{iv}$ and horizontal slopes on $T_{i(v+1)}, \dots, T_{ir_i}$. Choose an essential vertical torus T cutting M_i into two Seifert fibred pieces M_{i1} and M_{i2} where $\partial M_{i1} = T_{i1}, \dots, T_{iv}, T$ and $\partial M_{i2} = T_{i(v+1)}, \dots, T_{ir_i}, T$. Consider the restrictions $\mathfrak{o}_{ij}$ of $\mathfrak{o}_i$ to $\pi_1(M_{ij})$ for $j = 1, 2$. By construction

$\mathfrak{o}_{i1}$ detects $([h],\dots,[h],[\alpha])$ for some $[\alpha]\in\mathcal{S}(T)$, while $\mathfrak{o}_{i2}$ detects $[\alpha]$ on T and the same horizontal slopes as $\mathfrak{o}_i$ on $T_{i(v+1)},\dots,T_{ir_i}$. By Proposition 4.11 (2), $[\alpha]\neq[h]$ so $\mathfrak{o}_{i2}$ detects only horizontal slopes.

Case 2. M_i has base orbifold $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and $r_i\geq 2$. Choose an essential vertical torus T cutting M_i into M_{i1}, a Seifert fibred manifold over $Q_0(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, and M_{i2}, a Seifert fibred manifold with base orbifold a planar surface. Consider the restrictions $\mathfrak{o}_{ij}$ of $\mathfrak{o}_i$ to $\pi_1(M_{ij})$ for $j=1,2$. The ordering $\mathfrak{o}_{i1}$ of $\pi_1(M_{i1})$ detects $[h]$ by Proposition 4.7. If all slopes detected by $\mathfrak{o}_{i2}$ are vertical, make no further refinement. Otherwise cut M_{i2} into pieces as in Case 1.

Thus by refining the decomposition of W, and associating the restriction ordering to each piece in the refined decomposition, we can assume $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ is gluing coherent and each piece M_i with ordering $\mathfrak{o}_i$ satisfies one of the following:

(1) M_i is Seifert fibred over $Q(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ and $\mathfrak{o}_i$ detects $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]=([h],[h],\dots,[h])$.
(2) M_i is Seifert fibred over $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$, has $r\geq 2$ boundary components and $\mathfrak{o}_i$ detects $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]=([h],\dots,[h],[\alpha])$.
(3) M_i is Seifert fibred over $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ has $r\geq 1$ boundary components and $\mathfrak{o}_i$ detects $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$, which is horizontal.

With a decomposition into pieces of type (1)–(3), by and Lemmas 11.12, 11.11 and by Proposition 11.8 respectively, there are families $\mathcal{L}_i\subset LO(\pi_1(M_i))$ that are ready for gluing along $[\alpha_*^{(i)}]$. The result now follows from Proposition 11.7. Moreover, if $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal then the class of the fibre in M_i is cofinal in $\pi_1(M_i)$. By applying Lemmas 11.13 and 11.14, an induction on the number of pieces in W shows that the class of each fibre is cofinal in W. □

Proof of the order gluing theorem when $K\neq\emptyset$. Now suppose $K\neq\emptyset$. Suppose $\pi_1(W)$ admits a K-type left-ordering $\mathfrak{o}$ detecting the tuple $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$, and let $C\subset\pi_1(W)$ denote the $\mathfrak{o}$-convex normal subgroup such that $C\cap\pi_1(T_k)=\langle\alpha_k\rangle\cap\pi_1(T_k)$ for $k\in K$. Suppose there exists i such that $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i'}]_{rat})\cong S^1\times D^2$, and let $T_j=\partial M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i'}]_{rat})$. Observe that if $[\alpha_j]$ is rational, this forces $\alpha_j\in C$. Thus with $K'=K'([\alpha_*])$, observe that $\mathfrak{o}_i=\mathfrak{o}|\pi_1(M_i)$ detects $(K_i';[\alpha_*^{(i)}])$ with $C_i=\pi_1(M_i)\cap C$ the required convex subgroup (appealing to Remark 4.3(1) if there are any strongly detected irrational slopes). Thus $(K';[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed. Note that if we assume the class of every fibre is cofinal in $\pi_1(W)$, then $[\alpha_*]$ is horizontal as in the case $K=\emptyset$.

Conversely suppose that $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed, we may assume $[\alpha_*]$ is rational (Lemma 10.2) and proceed as in the proof of the foliation gluing theorem. Cut open W along T_j for $j\in K'$ and Dehn fill the boundary components along the slopes $[\alpha_j]$ for $j\in K'$ to produce a graph manifold W' with two or more components W_j whose pieces are of the form $M_i([\alpha_*^{K_i}]_{rat})$ for some i (here we use gluing unobstructed). By Lemma 4.4 each W_j admits a gluing coherent family of left-orderings, one for each piece in W_j, and so W_j has left-orderable fundamental group by the gluing theorem in the case $K=\emptyset$. There is a short exact sequence

$$1\to C\to\pi_1(W)\to\coprod\pi_1(W_j)\to 1$$

where the free product is amalgamated along cyclic subgroups corresponding to quotients of $\pi_1(T_j)$ for $j\in K'$, and is therefore left-orderable [BG, Corollary 5.3]. The subgroup C is left-orderable since $\pi_1(W)$ is left-orderable, by the gluing theorem with $K=\emptyset$. Thus we can construct a K-type left-ordering by lexicographically ordering $\pi_1(W)$ using the short exact sequence above. As in the case $K=\emptyset$, Lemmas 11.13 and 11.14 can be used inductively to show that if the initial $[\alpha_*]$ was horizontal, then the class of a fibre in any piece is cofinal in the constructed K-type left-ordering. □

12. Examples and remarks on smoothness

12.1. **Examples.** Brittenham, Naimi and Roberts provided examples of various phenomena concerning the existence and non-existence of taut foliations in non-Seifert fibred graph manifolds in their paper [BNR]. In particular, they found examples of such manifolds which do not admit taut foliations using methods similar to those found in this paper. Theorem 9.5 combined with the results of the Appendix can be used to construct many examples of such graph manifolds.

The next two examples show that the hypotheses of (i) admitting a co-oriented taut foliation, (ii) admitting a horizontal co-oriented taut foliation, and (iii) admitting a strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation are successively more constraining on a graph manifold W (cf. Theorems 1.2, 1.3, 1.5).

Example 12.1. Let W be the union of three pieces:

- M_1: a twisted I-bundle over the Klein bottle with rational longitude h_0;
- M_2: a cable space where $[h_0]$ is identified with the Seifert fibre slope $[h]$ of M_2;
- M_3: a trefoil exterior where $[h]$ is identified with a foliation detected slope chosen so that W is a rational homology 3-sphere.

Theorem 9.5 implies that W admits a co-oriented taut foliation but note that it does not admit a horizontal co-oriented taut foliation since any such foliation $\mathcal{F}$ can be isotoped so that it intersects M_1 in a foliation detecting $[h] \equiv [h_0] = \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M_1)$ (Proposition A.4) and therefore could not be horizontal in M_2.

Example 12.2. Let W be the union of two pieces:

- M_1: a twisted I-bundle over the Klein bottle with rational longitude h_0;
- M_2: a trefoil exterior where $[h_0]$ is identified with the meridional slope $[\mu]$ of M_2.

We claim that $[\mu]$ is representation detected, and therefore foliation detected, in M_2. To see this recall that $\pi_1(M_2) = \langle y_1, y_2, h : y_1^2 = h, y_2^3 = h^2, h \text{ central} \rangle$ where the meridional class corresponds to $y_1 y_2 h^{-1}$. According to [JN1, Propoition 2.2(a)] we can find elements A and B of $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ such that A is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(1/2)$, B is conjugate to translation by $\mathrm{sh}(2/3)$ and AB is a hyperbolic element of $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ of translation number 1. We obtain a representation $\rho \in \mathcal{R}_0(M_2)$ by sending y_1 to A, y_2 to B and h to $\mathrm{sh}(1)$. The meridional class is sent to a hyperbolic element of translation number 0, which proves the claim. Theorem 1.2 implies that W admits a co-oriented taut foliation which is in fact horizontal since $[h_0]$ is horizontal in M_1 and $[\mu]$ is horizontal in M_2 (cf. Proposition 6.2). But note that there is no strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation in W since it would have to intersect the torus $M_1 \cap M_2$ in a circle fibration of slope $[h_0] = [\mu]$. Thus $[\mu]$ would be strongly foliation detected in M_2, which is impossible since then $M_2(\mu_2) \cong S^3$ would admit a taut foliation.

In our next example we construct a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere W with JSJ tori $T_1, \dots, T_m$ and a subset $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that no $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is gluing unobstructed even though there are $[\alpha_*]$ such that $(K; [\alpha_*])$ is gluing coherent (cf. Theorem 9.5).

Example 12.3. Let W be the union of three pieces:

- M_1: a trefoil exterior with meridional slope $[\mu_1]$;
- M_2: a cable space glued to M_1 so that $M_1 \cup M_2$ is the exterior of a cable on the trefoil with meridional slope $[\mu_2]$;
- M_3: a twisted I-bundle over the Klein bottle with rational longitude $[h_0]$ identified to $[\mu_2]$.

The JSJ tori of W are $T_1 = M_1 \cap M_2$ and $T_2 = M_2 \cap M_3$ and we take $K = \{2\}$. We noted in the previous example that $[\mu_1]$ is foliation detected in M_1. It is not hard to see that $(\{1,2\}; ([\mu_1], [\mu_2]))$ is foliation

detected in M_2 while $(\{2\};[h_0]=[\mu_2])$ is foliation detected in M_3. Thus $(\{2\};([\mu_1],[h_0]))$ is gluing coherent. In fact, if $\{2\}\subseteq K\subseteq\{1,2\}$, the only $[\alpha_*]\in\mathcal{S}(W;\mathcal{T})$ for which $(K;[\alpha_*])$ gluing coherent is $([\mu_1],[h_0])$. On the other hand, since $M_2(\mu_2)\cong S^1\times D^2$, any $\{2\}$-type foliation on W necessarily intersects T_1 in a circle fibration of slope $[\mu_1]$, which is impossible since $[\mu_1]$ is not strongly detected in M_1 (cf. the last sentence of the previous example). Thus $(K;[\alpha_*])$ is gluing obstructed.

12.2. **Remarks of smoothness.** Let M be a compact orientable Seifert fibred manifold as in §2.2 and $J\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,r\}$. If $(J;[\alpha_*])$ is foliation-detected, it is $\mathcal{F}$-detected where $\mathcal{F}$ is analytic by Proposition 6.7. It follows that the foliations on a graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere W constructed in Theorem 1.5 can be taken to be smooth. On the other hand, we cannot expect the foliations constructed in the proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 to be smooth as the operation of thickening leaves used in their proofs does not preserve this property. That being said, the main results of this paper combine with those of the Appendix to imply that a generic (in terms of the gluing of its pieces) graph manifold rational homology 3-sphere W which admits a co-oriented taut foliation also admits a smooth strongly rational co-oriented taut foliation and in particular is not an L-space ([OSz1, Theorem 1.4]). Though it is unknown whether manifolds admitting topological co-oriented taut foliations admit smooth co-oriented taut foliations, there is enough control in our constructions for us to show that graph manifolds which admit topological co-oriented taut foliations are not L-spaces [BC]. Further remarks on the smoothness can be found in [BC].

Appendix A. The results of Eisenbud, Hirsch, Neumann, Jankins and Naimi

Let M be a Seifert manifold with base orbifold $P(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ as in §2.2 and recall that for $b\in\mathbb{Z}$, $J\subseteq\{1,2,\dots,r\}$, and $(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_r)\in\mathbb{R}^r$, we defined the notion of JN-realisability in §3.

For $(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_r)\in\mathbb{R}^r$ set

$$\bar{\tau}_j=\tau_j-\lfloor\tau_j\rfloor\in[0,1)\text{ for }j=1,\dots,r$$

and

$$b=b(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_r)=-(\lfloor\tau_1\rfloor+\ldots+\lfloor\tau_r\rfloor)$$

The reader can verify that $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J;b;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\bar{\tau}_1,\dots,\bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable.

First we consider the case when some of the τ_j are integers. For a fixed tuple τ_* we introduce the notation:

- $r_1=|\{j:\tau_j\notin\mathbb{Z}\}|$, the number of non-integral τ_j;
- $s_0=|\{j:j\notin J\text{ and }\tau_j\in\mathbb{Z}\}|$, the number of integral τ_j whose indices are not in J;
- $r_2=r_1+s_0$.

We also use J^0 to denote $J\setminus\{j:\tau_j\in\mathbb{Z}\}$.

Since JN-realisability of $(J;b;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\,\bar{\tau}_1,\dots,\bar{\tau}_r)$ is invariant under every permutation of the τ_j, we may assume that the τ_j are indexed so that $\tau_1,\dots,\tau_{r_1}$ are not integers, $\tau_{r_1+1}\dots,\tau_r$ are integers and $J\cap\{r_1+1,\dots,r\}=\{r_2+1,\dots,r\}$. Then $(J;b;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\,\bar{\tau}_1,\dots,\bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0;b;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\,\bar{\tau}_1,\dots,\bar{\tau}_{r_2})$ is JN-realisable since $\tau_j\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $j\in J$ forces the function g_j corresponding to $\bar{\tau}_j$ to be the identity.

Therefore, in the case when some of the τ_j are integers it suffices to consider the case where $j\in J$ implies $\tau_j\notin\mathbb{Z}$. For this case we have the following theorem:

Theorem A.1. ([JN2, Theorem 1]) *Suppose that if $j\in J$ then $\tau_j\notin\mathbb{Z}$ and let s be the number of τ_j which are integers. If $s>0$, then $(J;b;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\bar{\tau}_1,\dots,\bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only if $2-s\leq b\leq n+r-2$. It is then even JN-realisable in $\widetilde{PSL_2}(\mathbb{R})$.* □

Next we consider the case where no τ_j is an integer. If $n+r \leq 2$, the reader will verify that $(J; b; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only $\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n + \tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_r = 0$. For $n+r \geq 3$ we have the following theorem.

Theorem A.2. ([EHN], [JN2], [Na]) *Suppose that $n+r \geq 3, J \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 < \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_n, \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_r < 1$.*

(1) *If $(J; b; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable, then $1 \leq b \leq n+r-1$.*

(2) *If $2 \leq b \leq n+r-2$, then $(J; b; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable in $\widetilde{PSL_2}(\mathbb{R})$.*

(3) *$(J; n+r-1; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J; 1; 1-\gamma_1, \ldots, 1-\gamma_n; 1-\bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, 1-\bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable.*

(4) *$(J; 1; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only if there are coprime integers $0 < A < N$ and some permutation $(\frac{A_1}{N}, \frac{A_2}{N}, \ldots, \frac{A_{n+r}}{N})$ of $(\frac{A}{N}, 1-\frac{A}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \ldots, \frac{1}{N})$ such that*

- *$\gamma_i < \frac{A_i}{N}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$;*
- *$\bar{\tau}_j < \frac{A_j}{N}$ for all $j \in J$;*
- *$\bar{\tau}_j \leq \frac{A_j}{N}$ for all $j \notin J$.* □

We refer the reader to [CW] for an alternate and more direct approach to this result.

Now fix $J \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, r-1\}$ and $\tau_* = (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{r-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r-1}$. Define

$$\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = \{\tau' : (J; 0; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \ldots, \tau_{r-1}, \tau') \text{ is JN-realisable}\}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) = \{\tau' : (J \cup \{r\}; 0; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \ldots, \tau_{r-1}, \tau') \text{ is JN-realisable}\}$$

Both of these intervals are related to the set $\mathcal{D}_{rep}(M; J)$. The relationship is described in §3.

Theorems A.1 and A.2 allow us to determine $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*)$ precisely. As above we will reindex the tuple τ_* and define $r_1 = r_1(\tau_*)$, $s_0 = s_0(\tau_*)$ and $r_2 = r_2(\tau_*) = r_1(\tau_*) + s_0(\tau_*)$ so that $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{r_1}$ are not integers, $\tau_{r_1+1} \ldots, \tau_{r-1}$ are integers and $J \cap \{r_1+1, \ldots, r-1\} = \{r_2+1, \ldots, r-1\}$. We also introduce the notation:

- $b_0 = -(\lfloor \tau_1 \rfloor + \ldots + \lfloor \tau_{r-1} \rfloor)$;
- $b(\tau') = b_0 - \lfloor \tau' \rfloor$;
- $m_0 = b_0 - (n + r_1 + s_0 - 1)$;
- $m_1 = b_0 + s_0 - 1$.

We take J^0 to denote either $J \setminus \{j : \tau_j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ or $(J \setminus \{j : \tau_j \in \mathbb{Z}\}) \cup \{r\}$. We have already observed in the discussion before Theorem A.1 that $(J; 0; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{r-1}, \tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0; b(\tau'); \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_{r_2}, \overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable. Having reduced to this case we may then apply our previous observation that when no τ_j is an integer and $n+r \leq 2$, $(J; b; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_r)$ is JN-realisable if and only $\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n + \tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_r = 0$. This yields

Proposition A.3. *Fix $J \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, r-1\}$ and $\tau_* = (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{r-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r-1}$ where $r \geq 1$. Suppose that $n + r_1 + s_0 \leq 1$. Then*

$$\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) = \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = \{-\big[(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_{r-1})\big]\}$$

□

In general, $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*)$ and $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$ are determined by the following proposition.

Proposition A.4. *Fix $J \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, r-1\}$ and $\tau_* = (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{r-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r-1}$ where $r \geq 1$. Suppose that $n + r_1 + s_0 \geq 2$.*

(1) *(a) $(m_0, m_1) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \subset (m_0 - 1, m_1 + 1)$.*

(b) $[m_0, m_1] \subseteq \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$.

(c) *If* $s_0 > 0$ *then* $m_0 < m_1$ *and* $(m_0, m_1) = \mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) \subset \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = [m_0, m_1]$.

(2) (a) *If* $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_0 - 1, m_0) \neq \emptyset$, *then*
(i) $s_0 = 0$;
(ii) $|\{i : \gamma_i \leq \frac{1}{2}\}| + |\{j \in J : 0 < \bar{\tau}_j \leq \frac{1}{2}\}| + |\{j \notin J : 0 < \bar{\tau}_j < \frac{1}{2}\}| \leq 1$;
(iii) *there is some* $\eta \in (m_0 - 1, m_0] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ *such that* $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_0 - 1, m_0] = (\eta, m_0]$ *and* $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_0 - 1, m_0] = [\eta, m_0]$.

(b) *If* $n + r_1 = 2$, *then* $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_0 - 1, m_0) \neq \emptyset$ *if and only if either*
(i) $-\big[(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_{r-1})\big] < m_0$, *or*
(ii) $n = 0, -\sum_j \tau_j = m_0, J \cap \{j : \tau_j \notin \mathbb{Z}\} = \emptyset$, *and* $\tau_j \in \mathbb{Q}$ *for all* j.

(3) (a) *If* $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_1, m_1 + 1) \neq \emptyset$, *then*
(i) $s_0 = 0$;
(ii) $|\{i : \gamma_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}| + |\{j \in J : \bar{\tau}_j \geq \frac{1}{2}\}| + |\{j \notin J : \bar{\tau}_j > \frac{1}{2}\}| \leq 1$.
(iii) *there is some* $\xi \in (m_1, m_1 + 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ *such that* $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap [m_1, m_1 + 1) = [m_1, \xi)$ *and* $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap [m_1, m_1 + 1) = [m_1, \xi]$.

(b) *If* $n + r_1 = 2$, *then* $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_1, m_1 + 1) \neq \emptyset$ *if and only if either*
(i) $m_0 < -\big[(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_{r-1})\big]$, *or*
(ii) $n = 0, -\sum_j \tau_j = m_0, J \cap \{j : \tau_j \notin \mathbb{Z}\} = \emptyset$, *and* $\tau_j \in \mathbb{Q}$ *for all* j.

(4) (a) $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$ *is a closed subinterval of* $(m_0 - 1, m_1 + 1)$ *whose endpoints are rational numbers.*

(b) *Either* $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*)$ *is the interior of* $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$ *or* $s_0 = 0, n + r_1 = 2$ *and* $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) = \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = \{m_0\}$.

(c) $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) = \{m_0\}$ *if and only if* $s_0 = 0$, $n + r_1 = 2, m_0 = -\big[(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_{r-1})\big]$, *and either* $n \neq 0$, *or* $J \cap \{j : \tau_j \notin \mathbb{Z}\} \neq \emptyset$, *or* $\tau_j \notin \mathbb{Q}$ *for some* j.

Remark A.5. The conditions

$$-\big[(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_{r-1})\big] < m_0, > m_0, = m_0$$

appearing in parts (2), (3), and (4) of the proposition are equivalent (under the assumptions of that particular subcase), respectively, to the conditions

$$(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\bar{\tau}_1 + \ldots + \bar{\tau}_{r-1}) > 1, < 1, = 1$$

Proof of Proposition A.4. We use the notation introduced in the discussion preceding Proposition A.3. As we saw there, we need only consider JN-realisability of

$$(J^0; b(\tau'); \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_{r_2}, \overline{\tau'})$$

which we examine through consideration of the two cases $s_0 > 0$ and $s_0 = 0$.

Case 1. $s_0 > 0$

In this case we show that $(m_0, m_1) = \mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*)$ and $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = [m_0, m_1]$; note that when $s_0 > 0$ we have $m_1 - m_0 = (n + r_1 + s_0) + (s_0 - 2) \geq 2 + s_0 - 2 > 0$. Hence $m_1 > m_0$.

Subcase 1.1. $\tau' \notin \mathbb{Z}$

In this case, $(J; 0; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \ldots, \tau_{r-1}, \tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0; b(\tau'); \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_{r_1}, 0, \ldots, 0, \overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable where there are s_0 zeros in the latter. Since $n + r_1 + s_0 + 1 \geq 3$ we can apply Theorem A.1 to see that $(J^0; b(\tau'); \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \bar{\tau}_1, \ldots, \bar{\tau}_{r_1}, 0, \ldots, 0, \overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable if and only if $2 - s_0 \leq b(\tau') \leq (n + r_1 + s_0 + 1) - 2$. (Here the r of the theorem corresponds to $r_1 + s_0 + 1$.) Equivalently, when $s_0 > 0$ and $\tau' \notin \mathbb{Z}$, $(J; 0; \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \ldots, \tau_{r-1}, \tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $\tau' \in (m_0, m_1) \setminus \mathbb{Z}$.

Subcase 1.2. $\tau' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \notin J^0$

In this case, $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},0,\dots,0)$ is JN-realisable where there are s_0+1 zeros in the latter. Since $n+r_1+s_0+1\geq 3$ we can apply Theorem A.1 to see that $(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},0,\dots,0,\overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable if and only if $1-s_0\leq b(\tau')\leq n+r_1+s_0-1$. Equivalently, when $s_0>0,\tau'\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $r\notin J$, $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $\tau'\in[m_0,m_1]\cap\mathbb{Z}$.

Subcase 1.3. $\tau'\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $r\in J^0$

In this case, $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},0,\dots,0)$ is JN-realisable where there are s_0 zeros in the latter. Theorem A.1 implies that when $n+r_1+s_0\geq 3$, $(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n,\ \bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},0,\dots,0)$ is JN-realisable if and only if $2-s_0\leq b(\tau')\leq n+r_1+s_0-2$. Equivalently, if and only if $\tau'\in(m_0,m_1)\cap\mathbb{Z}$. We claim that the same holds when $n+r_1+s_0=2$. To see this, first note that in this case (n,r_1,s_0) is either $(0,0,2),(0,1,1)$ or $(1,0,1)$ and $m_1-m_0=s_0\in\{1,2\}$. We must show that $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')$ is not JN-realisable when $s_0=1$ and is only JN-realisable for $\tau=m_0+1$ when $s_0=2$.

If $(n,r_1,s_0)=(0,0,2)$, then $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(\emptyset;b_0-\tau';\emptyset;0,0)$ is JN-realisable which, the reader will verify, occurs if and only if $\tau'=m_0+1$. If $(n,r_1,s_0)=(0,1,1)$, $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0;b_0-\tau';\emptyset;\bar\tau_1,0)$ is JN-realisable where $\bar\tau_1\notin\mathbb{Z}$, which is impossible. Similarly if $(n,r_1,s_0)=(1,0,1)$, then $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(\emptyset;b_0-\tau';\gamma_1;0)$ is JN-realisable, which is impossible since $\gamma_1\notin\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof of Proposition A.4 when $s_0>0$. Combining the three subcases above we see that

$$(m_0,m_1)=\mathcal{T}_{str}(M;J;\tau_*)\subset\mathcal{T}(M;J;\tau_*)=[m_0,m_1]$$

Hence the proposition holds when $s_0>0$. □

Case 2. $s_0=0$

Here $r_1=r_2$, so

$$(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')\text{ is JN-realisable }\Leftrightarrow(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},\overline{\tau'})\text{ is JN-realisable}$$

Note that $m_1-m_0=n+r_1-2\geq 0$. By examining subcases we prepare the necessary results.

Subcase 2.1. $\tau'\notin\mathbb{Z}$

Here, $(J;0;\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\tau_1,\dots,\tau_{r-1},\tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\ \bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},\overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable. We can apply statement (1) of Theorem A.2 to see that if $(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\ \bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},\overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable then $m_1+1>\tau'>m_0-1$. As such, $(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\ \bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},\overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable if and only if one of the following holds:

(1) $m_0<\tau'<m_1$; this follows from applying statement (2) of Theorem A.2 with $r=r_1+1$ and $b=b(\tau')$.

(2) $m_0-1<\tau'<m_0$, in this case $b(\tau')=n+r_1$ and $(J^0;b(\tau');\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n;\ \bar\tau_1,\dots,\bar\tau_{r_1},\overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0;1;1-\gamma_1,\dots,1-\gamma_n;\ 1-\bar\tau_1,\dots,1-\bar\tau_{r_1},1-\overline{\tau'})$ is JN-realisable by (3) of Theorem A.2. By (4) of Theorem A.2, this happens if and only if there are coprime integers $0<A<N$ and a permutation $(\frac{A_1}{N},\dots,\frac{A_n}{N},\frac{B_1}{N},\dots,\frac{B_{r_1}}{N},\frac{C}{N})$ of $(\frac{A}{N},1-\frac{A}{N},\frac{1}{N},\dots,\frac{1}{N})$ such that

   (a) $1-\frac{A_i}{N}<\gamma_i$ for $1\leq i\leq n$;

   (b) $1-\frac{B_j}{N}<\bar\tau_j$ for all $j\in J^0$ and $1-\frac{B_j}{N}\leq\bar\tau_j$ for all $j\notin J^0$;

   (c) $1-\frac{C}{N}<\overline{\tau'}$ if $r\in J^0$ and $1-\frac{C}{N}\leq\overline{\tau'}$ if $r\notin J^0$.

(3) $m_1<\tau'<m_1+1$, in this case $b(\tau')=1$ and there are coprime integers $0<A<N$ and a permutation $(\frac{A_1}{N},\dots,\frac{A_n}{N},\frac{B_1}{N},\dots,\frac{B_{r_1}}{N},\frac{C}{N})$ of $(\frac{A}{N},1-\frac{A}{N},\frac{1}{N},\dots,\frac{1}{N})$ such that

(a) $\gamma_i < \frac{A_i}{N}$ for $1 \le i \le n$;

(b) $\bar\tau_j < \frac{B_j}{N}$ for all $j \in J^0$ and $\bar\tau_j \le \frac{B_j}{N}$ for all $j \notin J^0$;

(c) $\overline{\tau'} < \frac{C}{N}$ if $r \in J^0$ and $\overline{\tau'} \le \frac{C}{N}$ if $r \notin J^0$.

Subcase 2.2. $\tau' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \notin J^0$

Here we repeat the argument of Subcase 1.2 with $s_0 = 0$ and conclude that when $s_0 = 0, \tau' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \notin J$, $(J; 0; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \dots, \tau_{r-1}, \tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $\tau' \in [m_0, m_1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$.

Subcase 2.3. $\tau' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \in J^0$

Here, $(J; 0; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n; \tau_1 \dots, \tau_{r-1}, \tau')$ is JN-realisable if and only if $(J^0; b(\tau'); \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n; \bar\tau_1, \dots, \bar\tau_{r_1})$ is JN-realisable.

Subsubcase 2.3.1. $n + r_1 = 2$

In this case, the remarks preceding Proposition A.3 imply that $(J^0; b(\tau'); \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n; \bar\tau_1, \dots, \bar\tau_{r_1})$ is JN-realisable if and only if $\tau' = -[(\gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{r-1})]$.

Subsubcase 2.3.2. $n + r_1 \ge 3$

In this case we can apply Theorem A.2 to see that $(J^0; b(\tau'); \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n; \bar\tau_1, \dots, \bar\tau_{r_1})$ is JN-realisable if and only if one of the following three conditions hold:

(1) $\tau' \in [m_0 + 1, m_1 - 1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$;

(2) $\tau' = m_0$ and there are coprime integers $0 < A < N$ and a permutation $(\frac{A_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{A_n}{N}, \frac{B_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{B_{r_1}}{N})$ of $(\frac{A}{N}, 1 - \frac{A}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N})$ such that

(a) $1 - \frac{A_i}{N} < \gamma_i$ for $1 \le i \le n$;

(b) $1 - \frac{B_j}{N} < \bar\tau_j$ for all $j \in J^0$ and $1 - \frac{B_j}{N} \le \bar\tau_j$ for all $j \notin J^0$.

(3) $\tau' = m_1$ and there are coprime integers $0 < A < N$ and a permutation $(\frac{A_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{A_n}{N}, \frac{B_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{B_{r_1}}{N})$ of $(\frac{A}{N}, 1 - \frac{A}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N})$ such that

(a) $\gamma_i < \frac{A_i}{N}$ for $1 \le i \le n$;

(b) $\bar\tau_j < \frac{B_j}{N}$ for all $j \in J^0$ and $\bar\tau_j \le \frac{B_j}{N}$ for all $j \notin J^0$.

Proof of Proposition A.4 when $s_0 = 0$. Assertion (1) of the proposition holds by Subcases 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.

Next we prove assertion (2). Assertion (2)(a)(i) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = [m_0, m_1]$ when $s_0 > 0$, as proven in Case 1.

Next suppose that $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_0 - 1, m_0)$. Then τ' satisfies the condition Subcase 2.1(2). Hence there are coprime integers $0 < A < N$ and a permutation $(\frac{A_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{A_n}{N}, \frac{B_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{B_{r_1}}{N}, \frac{C}{N})$ of $(\frac{A}{N}, 1 - \frac{A}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N})$ satisfying the inequalities of the subsubcase. Since at most one of $\frac{A}{N}, 1 - \frac{A}{N}$ and $1 - \frac{1}{N}$ is less than $\frac{1}{2}$, we have $|\{i : \gamma_i \le \frac{1}{2}\}| + |\{j \in J : 0 < \bar\tau_j \le \frac{1}{2}\}| + |\{j \notin J : 0 < \bar\tau_j < \frac{1}{2}\}| \le 1$. Thus assertion (2)(a)(ii) holds.

For assertion (2)(a)(iii), observe that by Subcase 2.1,

$$(m_0 - 1, m_0) \cap \mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*) = \bigcup \left(m_0 - \frac{C}{N}, m_0\right)$$

and

$$(m_0 - 1, m_0) \cap \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = \bigcup \left[m_0 - \frac{C}{N}, m_0\right)$$

where the union is over coprime pairs $0 < A < N$ satisfying the constraints of Subcase 2.1(2).

Set

$$D = \frac{1}{1 - \max\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n, \bar\tau_1, \dots, \bar\tau_{r_1}\}}$$

If $n + r_1 \geq 3$ then for every coprime pair $0 < A < N$ satisfying the constraints of Subcase 2.1(2) either $1 - \frac{1}{N} < \gamma_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ or $1 - \frac{1}{N} \leq \bar\tau_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq r_1$, in particular $N \leq D$. Hence the unions above are over a finite index set, and assertion (2)(a)(iii) follows.

Suppose $n + r_1 = 2$. For every coprime pair $0 < A < N$ satisfying the constraints of Subcase 2.1(2), if $N > D$ then $1 - \frac{1}{N} > \max\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n, \bar\tau_1, \dots, \bar\tau_{r_1}\}$ and hence $1 - \frac{1}{N} < \overline{\tau'}$ and $\tau' \in [m_0 - \frac{1}{N}, m_0]$. In particular for coprime pairs $0 < A < N$ with $N > D$ the intervals $[m_0 - \frac{C}{N}, m_0]$ (resp. $(m_0 - \frac{C}{N}, m_0]$) in the union above are of the form $[m_0 - \frac{1}{N}, m_0]$ (resp. $(m_0 - \frac{1}{N}, m_0]$), and so there is a largest interval $[m_0 - \frac{1}{N'}, m_0]$ (resp. $(m_0 - \frac{1}{N'}, m_0]$), where

$$N' = \min\{N > D : \text{ a solution } 0 < A < N \text{ to the condition of Subcase 2.1(2) exists}\}$$

Hence assertion (2)(a)(iii) holds in this case as well.

Next we prove assertion (2)(b). Suppose that $n + r_1 = 2$ and write $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n, \bar\tau_1, \dots, \bar\tau_{r_1}) = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$. If $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_0 - 1, m_0) \neq \emptyset$, Subcase 2.1 implies that there are coprime integers $0 < A < N$ and a permutation $(\frac{A_1}{N}, \frac{A_2}{N}, \frac{A_3}{N})$ of $(\frac{A}{N}, 1 - \frac{A}{N}, \frac{1}{N})$ such that for $k = 1, 2$,

- $1 - \frac{A_k}{N} < \sigma_k$ if $\sigma_k = \gamma_i$ for some i or $\sigma_k = \bar\tau_j$ for some $j \in J^0$;
- $1 - \frac{A_k}{N} \leq \sigma_k$ otherwise.

Hence $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \geq 1$ and if $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 = 1$ then $n = 0$, $J \cap \{1, 2\} = \emptyset$, and $\sigma_j = 1 - \frac{A_k}{N}$ for some k and both j. Remark A.5 then implies that $-\big[(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_{r-1})\big] \leq m_0$ with equality implying that $n = 0$, $J \cap \{1, 2\} = \emptyset$, and $\tau_j \in \mathbb{Q}$ for all j.

Conversely suppose that $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \geq 1$. If $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 > 1$, choose coprime integers $0 < A < N$ such that $1 - \sigma_1 < \frac{A}{N} < \sigma_2$. Then $1 - \frac{A}{N} < \sigma_1$ and $1 - (1 - \frac{A}{N}) = \frac{A}{N} < \sigma_2$. Hence $[m_0 - \frac{1}{N}, m_0) \subset \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$. On the other hand, if $n = 0, J \cap \{1, 2\} = \emptyset$, $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ and $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 = 1$, choose coprime $0 < A < N$ such that $\sigma_1 = \frac{A}{N}$. Then $\sigma_2 = 1 - \frac{A}{N}$ and $(1 - \frac{1}{N}, m_0) \subset \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$. This completes the proof of assertion (2)(b).

Assertion (3) of the proposition follows similarly.

Assertion (4)(a) is a consequence of assertions (1), (2) and (3).

Consider Assertion (4)(b) and write $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = [\eta, \xi]$ where $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{Q}$. If $\xi > \eta$, then neither ξ nor η is contained in $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*)$. Assertion (1) shows that $\eta \leq m_0$ and $\xi \geq m_1$. Assertions (1), (2) and (3) show that we are done as long as $\eta < m_0$ and $\xi > m_1$. Assume otherwise, say $\xi = m_1 \in \mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*)$. Then when $\tau' = \xi$ we are in the situation described in Subcase 2.3. If $n + r_1 \geq 3$, Subsubcase 2.3.2(3) implies that there are coprime integers $0 < A < N$ and a permutation $(\frac{A_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{A_n}{N}, \frac{B_1}{N}, \dots, \frac{B_{r_1}}{N})$ of $(\frac{A}{N}, 1 - \frac{A}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N})$ such that

- $\gamma_i < \frac{A_i}{N}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$;
- $\bar\tau_j < \frac{B_j}{N}$ for all $j \in J^0$ and $\bar\tau_j \leq \frac{B_j}{N}$ for all $j \notin J^0$.

But then by Subcase 2.1(3), there is some $C \in \{1, A, N - A\}$ such that $(m_1, m_1 + \frac{C}{N}] \subset \mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$, contrary to hypothesis. Thus we must have $n + r_1 = 2$ and therefore, $m_0 = m_1 = b_0 - 1$. Subsubcase 2.3.1 then shows that $m_1 = \xi = -\big[(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_{r-1})\big]$. By hypothesis, $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_1, m_1 + 1) = \emptyset$, so now assertions (2)(a)(iii) and (3)(a)(iii) imply that $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) \cap (m_0 - 1, m_0) = \emptyset$ and therefore $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = \{m_0\}$, contrary to our assumptions. We conclude that $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M; J; \tau_*)$ is the interior of $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*)$ when the latter is a non-degenerate interval.

To complete the proof of (4)(b) suppose that $\eta = \xi$, that is, $\mathcal{T}(M; J; \tau_*) = \{m_0\}$. Then $m_0 = m_1$ so that $n + r_1 = 2$. On the other hand since the base orbifold of M is orientable, the rational longitude λ_M

of M is horizontal. It follows that $[\lambda_M]$ is strongly representation detected. Thus $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{T}_{str}(M;J;\tau_*) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(M;J;\tau_*) = \{m_0\}$. Hence $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M;J;\tau_*) = \mathcal{T}(M;J;\tau_*) = \{m_0\}$.

Consider (4)(c). If $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M;J;\tau_*) = \{m_0\}$ then by (4)(b) we see that $n + r_1 = 2$ and therefore Assertions (2)(b) and (3)(b) combine with Remark A.5 to show that $m_0 = -\big[(\gamma_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n) + (\tau_1 + \ldots + \tau_{r-1})\big]$ and either $n \neq 0$, or $J \cap \{j : \tau_j \notin \mathbb{Z}\} \neq \emptyset$, or $\tau_j \notin \mathbb{Q}$ for some j.

Conversely, if $n+r_1 = 2, -\big[(\gamma_1+\ldots+\gamma_n)+(\tau_1+\ldots+\tau_{r-1})\big] = m_0$, and either $n \neq 0$, or $J\cap\{j : \tau_j \notin \mathbb{Z}\} \neq \emptyset$, or $\tau_j \notin \mathbb{Q}$ for some j, then Assertions (2)(b) and (3)(b) together with Subsubcase 2.3.1 imply that $\mathcal{T}_{str}(M;J;\tau_*) = \{m_0\}$. □

This completes the proof of Proposition A.4. □

Corollary A.6. *Let M be a Seifert manifold with base orbifold $P(a_1,\ldots,a_n)$ as in §2.2 and fix horizontal $[\alpha_j] \in \mathcal{S}(T_j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq r-1$. For each $J \subseteq \{1,2,\ldots,r\}$, $\{[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T_r) : ([\alpha_1],\ldots,[\alpha_{r-1}],[\alpha]) \in \mathcal{D}_{rep}(M;J)\}$ is a non-empty subinterval of the set of horizontal slopes in $\mathcal{S}(T_r)$ which is closed when $r \notin J$. Further, either*

(1) *the endpoints of this subinterval are rational, or*

(2) *M has no singular fibres and, after reindexing, $J \supseteq \{2,3,\ldots,r-1\}$, $[\alpha_j] = [\tau_j h - h_j^*]$ where τ_1 is irrational and $\tau_2,\ldots,\tau_{r-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{D}_{rep}(M;J) = \mathcal{D}_{rep}(M;J\cup\{r\})$ and $\{[\alpha] \in \mathcal{S}(T_r) : ([\alpha_1],\ldots,[\alpha_{r-1}],[\alpha]) \in \mathcal{D}_{rep}(M;J)\}$ consists of a single irrational slope $[\alpha] = [(\tau_1+\tau_2+\ldots+\tau_{r-1})h+h_r^*]$*

Proof. Suppose that $[\alpha_*] = ([\alpha_1],\ldots,[\alpha_r])$ is horizontal, say $[\alpha_j] = [\tau_j h - h_j^*]$ for some $\tau_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and each j. Then $([\alpha_*];J)$ is representation detected if and only if $\tau_r \in \mathcal{T}_{str}(M;J;(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_{r-1}))$ when $r \in J$ and if and only if $\tau_r \in \mathcal{T}(M;J\setminus\{r\};(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_{r-1}))$ when $r \notin J$. The corollary now follows from the previous two propositions. □

Note that when $r = 1$, M fibres over the circle with fibre slope $[\lambda_M]$. Thus Corollary A.6 immediately implies the following result.

Corollary A.7. *Let M be a Seifert manifold with base orbifold $P(a_1,\ldots,a_n)$ as in §2.2 and suppose that ∂M is connected. Then $\mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$ is a closed subinterval with rational endpoints of the set of horizontal slopes in $\mathcal{S}(\partial M)$. Further, $[\lambda_M] \in \mathcal{D}_{fol}(M)$.* □

Proposition A.8. *Suppose that $(J;b;\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_n;\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_r)$ is JN-realisable in $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ by $f_1,\ldots,f_n$, $g_1,\ldots,g_r$ (cf. §3), then it is JN-realisable in $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ by $f_1',\ldots,f_n',g_1',\ldots,g_r'$ where no g_j' is parabolic.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we suppose that $g_1,\ldots,g_s$ are elliptic, $g_{s+1},\ldots,g_t$ are hyperbolic, and $g_{t+1},\ldots,g_r$ are parabolic. Then $J \subseteq \{1,\ldots,s\}$.

If $r = t$ we are done, so assume otherwise. If $t > s$ write

$$g_{t+1} = g_t^{-1} \circ h \circ h' \circ \mathrm{sh}(b)$$

where $h = (f_1 \circ \cdots \circ f_n \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_{t-1})^{-1}$ and $h' = (g_{t+2} \circ \cdots \circ g_r)^{-1}$. There is an open neighbourhood of g_t in $\widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})_k$ consisting entirely of hyperbolics of the same translation number. As g_t varies in this neighbourhood, the product $g_t^{-1} \circ h \circ h' \circ \mathrm{sh}(b)$ varies over an open neighbourhood of g_{t+1}. As such a neighbourhood contains hyperbolics of the same translation number as g_{t+1}, we can arrange for g_{t+1} to be hyperbolic up to replacing g_t as above and leaving the f_i and remaining g_j alone. An induction on $r - t$ then completes the proof when $t > s$.

Assume then that $t = s$, so $g_{s+1},\ldots,g_r$ are parabolic. After conjugating in $\mathrm{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{R})$ by $F(x) = \frac{x}{k}$ we have $f_1,\ldots,f_n,g_1,\ldots,g_r \in \widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$, f_i is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(k\gamma_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, g_j is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(k\tau_j)$ for $j \in J$ and has translation number $k\tau_j$ otherwise, and $f_1 \circ \ldots \circ f_n \circ g_1 \circ \ldots \circ g_r = \mathrm{sh}(kb)$.

If $r = s+1$ there are at least two non-integers among $\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_n,\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_{r-1}$ as otherwise the identity $f_1 \circ \cdots \circ f_n \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_r = \mathrm{sh}(kb)$ would imply that g_r is conjugate to $\mathrm{sh}(x)$ for some real number x. This

is not possible since g_r is parabolic. The result is then a straightforward consequence of [JN1, Corollary 2.3]. Examination of the figures in [JN1, Corollary 2.3] shows that for each parabolic element of the shaded regions, there is a hyperbolic element in that region of the same translation number.

If $r > s+1$, then up to conjugation we can suppose that g_{s+1} and g_{s+2} are lifts of the elements $\pm\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1 & \epsilon\\ 0 & 1\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ and $\pm\left(\begin{smallmatrix}a & b\\ c & 2-a\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ in $PSL(2,\mathbb{R})$ where $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. For x arbitrarily close to 1 and y arbitrarily close but not equal to 0 such that $cy \leq 0$, consider

$$\begin{aligned}\pm\begin{pmatrix}1 & \epsilon\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}a & b\\ c & 2-a\end{pmatrix} &= \pm\begin{pmatrix}1 & \epsilon\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}x & y\\ 0 & \frac{1}{x}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{x} & -y\\ 0 & x\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}a & b\\ c & 2-a\end{pmatrix}\\ &= \pm\begin{pmatrix}x & y+\frac{\epsilon}{x}\\ 0 & \frac{1}{x}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\frac{a}{x}-cy & \frac{b}{x}-(2-a)y\\ cx & (2-a)x\end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

If $c = 0$ then note that $a = 1$ and both matrices on the second line are hyperbolic. On the other hand if $c \neq 0$, then the matrix with trace $1/x + x$ is clearly hyperbolic, whereas the other matrix has trace $t(x) = a/x - cy + (2-a)x$. Since $t(1) = 2 - cy > 2$, for x sufficiently close to 1 this matrix is hyperbolic as well. It follows that we can always find an element $h \in \widetilde{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ arbitrarily close to the identity so that if we set $g'_{s+1} = g_{s+1}h$ and $g'_{s+2} = h^{-1}g_{s+2}$, then $g'_{s+1}g'_{s+2} = g_{s+1}g_{s+2}$ where g'_{s+1}, resp. g'_{s+2}, is hyperbolic of the same translation number as g_{s+1}, resp. g_{s+2}. We can now apply the case $t > s$ to complete the proof. □

References

[BG] V. V. Bludov and A. M. W. Glass, *Word problems, embeddings, and free products of right-ordered groups with amalgamated subgroup*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **99** (2009), 285–608.

[BB] M. Boileau and S. Boyer, *Graph manifolds $\mathbb{Z}$-homology 3-spheres and taut foliations*, preprint 2013, arXiv:1303.5264.

[BC] S. Boyer and A. Clay, *Graph manifolds with left-orderable fundamental groups are not L-spaces*, preprint 2014.

[BGW] S. Boyer, C. McA. Gordon, and L. Watson, *On L-spaces and left-orderable fundamental groups*, Math. Ann. **356** (2013), 1213–1245.

[BRW] S. Boyer, D. Rolfsen, and B. Wiest, *Orderable 3-manifold groups*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **55** (2005), 243–288.

[Br1] M. Brittenham, *Essential laminations in Seifert-fibered spaces: Boundary behaviour*, Top. Appl. **95** (1999), 47–62.

[Br2] ———, *Tautly foliated 3-manifolds with no $\mathbb{R}$-covered foliations*, in **Foliations: geometry and dynamics** (Warsaw, 2000), 213–224, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2002.

[BNR] M. Brittenham, R. Naimi, and R. Roberts, *Graph manifolds and taut foliations*, J. Diff. Geom. **47** (1997), 446–470.

[Ca1] D. Calegari, *Leafwise smoothing laminations*, Alg. & Geom. Top. **1** (2001), 579–585.

[Ca2] ———, **Foliations and the Geometry of 3-manifolds**, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2007.

[CD] D. Calegari and N. Dunfield, *Laminations and groups of homeomorphisms of the circle*, Invent. Math. **152** (2003), 149–204.

[CW] D. Calegari and A. Walker, *Ziggurats and rotation numbers*, J. Mod. Dynamics **5** (2011), 711–746.

[CC1] A. Candel and L. Conlon, **Foliations I**, Graduate Studies in Mathematics 23, Amer. Math. Soc., 2000.

[CC2] ———, **Foliations II**, Graduate Studies in Mathematics 60, Amer. Math. Soc., 2003.

[Ch] I. Chiswell, *Right orderability and graphs of groups*, J. Group Theory **14** (2011), 589–601.

[CLW] A. Clay, T. Lidman, and L. Watson, *Graph manifolds, left-orderability and amalgamation*, Alg. & Geom. Top. **13** 4 (2013), 2347–2368.

[CR] A. Clay, D. Rolfsen, *Ordered groups, eigenvalues, knots, surgery and L-spaces*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **152** 1 (2012), 115–129.

[Co] P. F. Conrad, *Right-Ordered Groups*, Michigan Math. J., **6** (1959), 267–275.

[EHN] D. Eisenbud, U. Hirsch, and W. Neumann, *Transverse foliations on Seifert bundles and self-homeomorphisms of the circle*, Comm. Math. Helv. **56** (1981), 638–660.

[ET] Y. Eliashberg, W. Thurston **Confoliations**, University Lecture Series **13** (1998), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, USA

[Ga1] D. Gabai, *Foliations and the topology of 3-manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom. **18** (1983), 445–503. **60** (1985), 480–495.

[Ga2] ———, *Taut foliations of 3-manifolds and suspensions of S^1*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **42** (1992), 193–208. **60** (1985), 480–495.

[Gh] E. Ghys, *Groups acting on the circle*, L'Enseignement Math. **22** (2001), 329–407.
[JN1] M. Jankins and W. Neumann, *Homomorphisms of Fuchsian groups to $PSL(2,\mathbb{R})$*, Comm. Math. Helv. **60** (1985), 480–495.
[JN2] ———, *Rotation numbers and products of circle homomorphisms*, Math. Ann. **271** (1985), 381–400.
[Ju] A. Juhász, *A survey of Heegaard Floer homology*, to appear in **New ideas in low-dimensional topology**, arXiv:1310.3418.
[KMOS] P. Kronheimer, T. Mrowka, P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó, *Monopoles and lens space surgeries*, Ann. of Math. **165** (2007), 457–546.
[Li] P. Linnell, *Left-ordered amenable and locally indicable groups*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **60** (1999), 133–142.
[LS] P. Lisca and A. Stipsicz, *Ozsváth-Szabó invariants and tight contact 3-manifolds III*, J. Symplectic Geom. **5** (2007), 357–384.
[Na] R. Naimi, *Foliations transverse to fibers of Seifert manifolds*, Comm. Math. Helv. **69** (1994), 155–162.
[Nav] A. Navas, *On the dynamics of (left) orderable groups*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **60** (2010), 1685–1740.
[OSz1] P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó, *Holomorphic disks and genus bounds*, Geom. Topol. **8** (2004), 311–334 (electronic).
[OSz2] ———, *On knot Floer homology and lens space surgeries*, Topology **44** (2005), 1281–1300.
[Se] J-P. Serre, **Trees**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
[Si] A.S. Sikora, *Topology on the spaces of orderings of groups*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **36** (2004), 519–526.
[Wa1] L. Watson, *Surgery obstructions from Khovanov homology*, Selecta Math. (N.S.), **18** (2012), 417–472.
[Wa2] ———, *Heegaard Floer homology solid tori*, invited presentation in AMS Session: Knots, Links, and Three-manifolds, San Diego, January 2013.

Département de Mathématiques, Université du Québec à Montréal, 201 avenue du Président-Kennedy, Montréal, QC H2X 3Y7.

E-mail address: boyer.steven@uqam.ca

URL: http://www.cirget.uqam.ca/boyer/boyer.html

Département de Mathématiques, Université du Québec à Montréal, 201 avenue du Président-Kennedy, Montréal, QC H2X 3Y7.

E-mail address: aclay@cirget.ca

URL: http://thales.math.uqam.ca/~aclay/

Current address for Adam Clay: Department of Mathematics, 342 Machray Hall, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, R3T 2N2.

E-mail address: Adam.Clay@umanitoba.ca

URL: http://server.math.umanitoba.ca/~claya/